

The amendment was agreed to, as follows:

On page 6, line 8, after the word "restrained," insert a comma and the words:

But no injunction or temporary restraining order shall be issued on account of any threat or unlawful act excepting against the person or persons making the threat or committing the unlawful act or actually authorizing or ratifying the same after actual knowledge thereof.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has taken place here in the last 15 minutes, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an opinion given by a workman at one time when he said that he understood that a court of equity was called a chancery court because, he said, the workman never had a chance in that court.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I desire to propose an amendment to the pending bill and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and lie on the table.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BLAINE was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BLAINE to the bill (S. 935) to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes, viz: Add a new paragraph to section 8, to read as follows:

"(b) If at any stage of the proceedings under this act it shall appear to the court or be specifically alleged by the defendants or either of them that the complainant or any detective or other person directly or indirectly employed by him in connection with industrial relations has incited, promoted, or encouraged the labor dispute giving rise to the proceedings or any unlawful acts in connection therewith, all proceedings hereunder shall be suspended and any restraining order or temporary injunction shall be inoperative until a hearing and determination has been had to determine the facts with respect to such allegations, and the court shall thereupon require that issue be joined and that a hearing thereon shall be immediately held.

"Testimony relating to such issue shall be taken in the same manner as is taken in equity proceedings within the jurisdiction of said court.

"After the taking of such testimony, if the court finds against the complainant on the issue joined the court shall make a finding of fact and shall assess against the complainant, and the defendants shall recover threefold the loss, expense, and damage caused by the issuance of such restraining order or temporary injunction, together with all reasonable costs, including a reasonable attorney's fee, incurred in the action instituted by complainants, and where there is more than one defendant, the amount assessed and recovered shall be apportioned among the defendants according to their respective interests as may be shown in said proceeding, and any restraining order or temporary injunction issued in the action instituted by complainants shall be dissolved as a part of the judgment for damages and costs on the special issue joined.

"A review of such findings and the judgment rendered in such matter may be had in the same manner as is now provided for a review in equity proceedings of which said court has jurisdiction."

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. President, there was addressed to the Vice President by Mr. Paul Howland, on behalf of the American Bar Association, a letter in reference to the pending bill, which I ask to have incorporated in the proceedings of to-day in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

CLEVELAND, February 20, 1932.

Re S. 935

Hon. CHARLES CURTIS,

Vice President of the United States,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We have been advised that S. 935 will be up for consideration by the Senate on Tuesday, the 23d of this month. We feel that the position taken by the American Bar Association with reference to legislation of this character should be called to the attention of the Senate.

This position of the American Bar Association is evidenced by the formal action taken at its annual meeting at Memphis in 1929, and reported in volume 54 at page 93 of its annual report. This action consisted of the approval of the following resolution:

"That the association authorize continued opposition to all legislation radically limiting the jurisdiction of Federal courts, or decreasing the power thereof."

The full report of the committee touching upon this subject will be found at page 373 of said annual report.

Again, in the annual report of the American Bar Association, volume 55 for the year 1930, on page 68, the association adopted the following recommendation of the committee on jurisprudence and law reform:

"Your committee recommends continued opposition to all legislation radically limiting the jurisdiction of Federal courts, or decreasing the power thereof, adhering in this respect to the instructions of the association at its Memphis meeting in 1929."

Again, on page 70, the association adopted the following recommendation with reference to S. 2496, then known as the Shipstead bill:

"Your committee recommends the defeat of S. 2496, known as the Shipstead bill, limiting the jurisdiction of Federal courts sitting in equity or labor disputes, and fixing the public policy in relation thereto, on the ground that it is legislation with reference to a particular class and not uniform in its operation; that it surrounds the courts with so many limitations and conditions that it destroys the judicial power and renders the court helpless to restrain unlawful acts until after the damage has been done."

At the annual meeting of the American Bar Association held at Atlantic City in September, 1931, the committee on jurisprudence and law reform reported to the association upon this general subject, as follows:

"Your committee will continue its opposition to all legislation limiting the jurisdiction of Federal courts, or decreasing the power thereof, adhering strictly to the instructions of the association at Memphis in 1929 and at Chicago in 1930."

Yours respectfully,

PAUL HOWLAND,

Chairman Committee on Jurisprudence and Law Reform of the American Bar Association.

RECESS

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 1, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Francis J. Hurney, of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We pray Thee, O Almighty and Eternal God of Might, Wisdom, and Justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgment decreed, assist with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude the President of these United States, that his administration may be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Thy people, over whom he presides, by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion, by a faithful execution of the laws in justice and mercy, and by great charity and devotion toward all those who to-day are in dire need. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct all the deliberations of this national body and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

We recommend likewise to Thy unbounded mercy all our fellow citizens throughout these United States, that they may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Thy most holy law, that they may be preserved in union and in that peace which the world can not give, and after enjoying the blessings of this life be admitted to those which are everlasting. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 27, 1932, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On February 20, 1932:

H. R. 6304. An act to transfer Lavaca County from the Houston division to the Victoria division of the southern judicial district of Texas.



On February 23, 1932:

H. R. 81. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Catawissa Railroad Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Susequehanna River at or near Catawissa, Pa.; and

H. R. 7247. An act authorizing the Rhode Island State Board of Public Roads and the State Highway Department of the State of Connecticut to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pawcatuck River near the location of the present Broad Street Bridge between Westerly, R. I., and Stonington, Conn.

On February 24, 1932:

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution amending section 1 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved July 3, 1930, relating to the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Illinois River and Minneapolis.

On February 27, 1932:

H. R. 9203. An act to improve the facilities of the Federal reserve system for the service of commerce, industry, and agriculture, to provide means for meeting the needs of member banks in exceptional circumstances, and for other purposes.

#### EMERGENCY ROAD BILL

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Arthur M. Hyde, gave out a statement, appearing in all of the newspapers this morning, upbraiding the House of Representatives for passing the emergency road construction bill by 96 majority. I am to-day handing out to the press the following reply to Secretary Hyde:

Secretary Hyde knows as much about Federal-aid roads and unemployment as he does about agriculture. For a long time the American farmer has taken his measure, and now laughs at his silly utterances. The charge that the emergency road bill was railroaded through the House is utterly false.

On December 4, 1930, President Herbert Hoover, transmitting a Budget estimate to Congress for an emergency relief appropriation calling for an expenditure of \$80,000,000 for roads, said: "The test of the value of such relief is the ability to pay wages between now and the end of the fiscal year, and I therefore urge that this estimate be given early consideration."

Acting on the President's recommendation, the measure was not permitted to go to the legislative Committee on Roads, but Chairman WILL R. WOOD, of the Appropriations Committee, conducted hearings, lasting only two days, and rushed it through the House under an unanimous-consent agreement with less than two hours' discussion and by unanimous vote.

If there was need for this expenditure in 1930, there is a double necessity for it at this time. We have followed almost verbatim the procedure used at that time, except that our hearings extended for three days and there was nearly six hours' discussion in the House. I repeat that all the evidence shows that this fund when matched by the States will give employment directly and indirectly to 1,000,000 people. Chairman WOOD and other Republican leaders vested with responsibility favored same in 1930 and urged it as an unemployment aid. This year, when divested of responsibility, Mr. WOOD and his associates for partisan reasons opposed the very thing they are all on record as favoring.

Let the Senate pass the measure and, as has been intimated, let the President veto it. We will confront them with their own words.

It is a piece of unmitigated gall for Secretary Hyde to upbraid the Democratic House in passing the first piece of legislation that will give a job to a single human being in America when his own party sat by impotent and suggested nothing. He speaks of the deficit, and I remind him that all of it was created under the present administration, and it remained for the Democratic House to endeavor to balance the Budget when the administration refused to even attempt it.

[Applause.]

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina, may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I call the gentleman's attention to

the fact that, in spite of vigorous opposition by Republican leaders, many of his colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle supported this measure last Saturday, which is the only bill passed thus far that guarantees any real relief to unemployment.

Mr. DYER. I am not criticizing. I simply make this request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The statement of Mr. Hyde is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ARTHUR M. HYDE  
FEBRUARY 28, 1932

Yesterday the Democratic organization in the House railroaded through a bill for \$132,000,000 for roads. The bill was produced on Friday and pushed through, under very stringent rules, on Saturday. A bare 24 hours' notice was given. No consultation was held with the Treasury, which must propose methods of taxation to meet the expenditure. No advice was sought from the Ways and Means Committee as to how they are to meet so large an increase in expenditure and balance the Budget.

The bill was passed in entire disregard of the assurances given some weeks ago to the country by the Democratic leadership in the House that they would oppose all authorization bills, and after they had severely trimmed the Budget recommendations for funds for departmental services. From the regular road appropriations for this department, for instance, they deducted, with great parade of economy, the sum of \$10,000,000. They now propose to spend \$132,000,000 for the same purposes. At a time when the country is crying for economies of administration and expenditure they pass a bill which requires more expenditures than all of the economies which have painfully and laboriously been achieved by the Appropriations Committee.

The bill purports to be a bill for the relief of agriculture and of unemployment. So far as agriculture is concerned an expenditure of a maximum of \$200,000,000 for crop-production loans has already been passed. I should like to call attention also to the fact that, as to the \$132,000,000 road bill, the farmer will gain in only part of the fund and will be compelled to pay, directly and indirectly, a considerable portion of the additional taxes which the bill will necessitate.

The Treasury Department and the Ways and Means Committee have been working in complete harmony and with courageous determination to balance the Budget and to preserve unimpaired the credit of the United States Government. This is a matter of vital concern to every person in the country. It is the cornerstone of renewed prosperity. The price to be paid is increased taxation, but not one penny more should be levied in taxes than the needs of the situation imperatively demand. Already increases in corporation, income, and estate taxes have been proposed to the maximum limit. Even these are not adequate. It has been found necessary to resort to a manufacturers' sales tax. Therefore, the increased burden imposed by this bill must be met, if met at all, by further increases in taxes upon commodities and services. The farmer is a large purchaser of such commodities and will have to pay his part of such increased taxes.

An excessive increase in road expenditures from the Federal Treasury this year would undoubtedly endanger the stable development of the Federal-aid program in the future. Excessive emergency support of Federal aid in some years will probably result in insufficient support in other years and thus impair the whole program. That would be disastrous. An assured annual program is much more important to the proper development of our highway system than any possible emergency and artificial stimulus which is of necessity temporary in its nature.

The \$132,000,000 provided by this bill will give, directly and in itself, employment to about 35,000 people. This out of 6,000,000 unemployed. True it will create some indirect employment, but the number so benefited will certainly be less than the number directly affected. By extracting \$132,000,000 additional funds from agriculture and industry, we shall impose still further strain upon the country and shall deprive more people of employment indirectly than we can employ directly.

The bill has more of the aspects of the pork barrel than of relief from unemployment. Our experience last year is in point. The Federal Government made an appropriation which resulted in an expenditure of \$155,000,000 additional Federal funds for road building. The States and local districts reduced the expenditure of their own funds by three-fourths of this amount. In practical operation we expended \$155,000,000 more Federal funds, but secured an increase in total funds expended—local, State, and Federal—of only \$33,000,000. The net gain in employment from Federal funds was disappointing. The net result was a larger and disproportionate drain upon the Federal Treasury.

The allocation of the fund would be made under the law regulating road funds, rather than upon a per capita basis. The benefits of the fund, therefore, would be unequally distributed. The States having the least population would receive the largest per capita allocation. The States having the greatest population and the largest unemployment problem would receive the smallest per capita allocation. The bill does not go to the problem of unemployment on the basis of need.



But further than all this, if there is to be economy in public expenditures and relief from burdens of taxation upon the people, economy must begin. The President has forcefully said, "We can not squander ourselves into prosperity." The bill ought not to be enacted.

#### TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9699, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9699, with Mr. HOWARD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. There remain 80 minutes of debate, according to the unanimous agreement made on Saturday last, 40 minutes on either side.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, there are several matters in this bill that I intended to discuss, but a subject has come up which I believe requires a definite reply; and I shall defer taking up the matters in the bill until we get under the 5-minute rule, at which time I expect to offer some amendments.

I had occasion a few days ago to call attention to the disgraceful conditions brought about in the aviation industry by the Century Air Lines in their attempt to so reduce the wages of skilled experienced pilots and the danger to aviation involved through the avarice of this company. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] called attention to the testimony of one E. L. Cord before the Committee on Appropriations. Had that testimony been given by any reputable operator of an air line, had it been given by any citizen who has a proper regard for the safety of the traveling public, and the rights of labor, the testimony would have been very impressive. In fact, after the testimony was given, many Members of the House looked into the terms of existing air mail contracts. No sooner had Mr. Cord left the Committee on Appropriations than he went back to Illinois and started reducing wages, which gives an entirely different aspect to his reliability and the value of his proposition. In other words, he seeks to get Government contracts by lowering the rates and plans to make up the difference out of the pay of pilots.

As far back as last May the Century Air Lines (Inc.) indicated the kind of tactics they were willing to employ against competitors. These tactics will, in turn, indicate the caliber of men operating this company. Just as they came to Washington seeking to get contracts away that are now held by other companies by any means fair or otherwise, just as they are willing to disregard safety by underpaying and overworking pilots, so last May they even went so far as to arrange for the use of violence in competing against reputable companies. Yes; they actually recommended the use of violence and the employment of thugs. I made this charge a few days ago, startling and shocking as it is, by reading a letter written by the traffic manager of the Century Air Lines to their own terminal manager at Detroit. I am going to read it again. The reason I do so, and shall continue to do so, is because this man, E. L. Cord, has the brazen effrontery to deliberately misrepresent facts, to deliberately misinform the public in an attempt to deceive the Congress, in an attempt to deceive the Post Office Department, in an attempt to deceive the public, and in a desperate effort to hide their own contemptible shame, to conceal their own disgraceful conduct, and to pose as persons who have been unjustly criticized. Just let me read this letter again:

CHICAGO, May 16, 1931.

Mr. GEORGE H. PFEUFFER,  
Terminal Manager, Detroit, Mich.

DEAR SIR: Any number of people, including executives of the Cord Corporation, have advised me that Thompson is making a

practice of telling our passengers, who are on the bus with their passengers on the 1.30 schedule, that they should ask for refund of their ticket and get out on the first ship—which is Thompson's—and that you have no hesitancy in refunding their money to them so that they can do this.

I can not understand why it should be necessary for anyone to tell you not to permit this, but rather arrange to offset it and, if possible, give Thompson a dose of their own medicine, but it seems that some one must tell everybody just what to do.

Why don't you get some good, hard-boiled scrapper and ride him on that bus all day long. If he hears anyone making a suggestion to any passenger about Thompson, have this tough beat him up. It was necessary to do this in the early railroad days and also in the taxicab and bus developments, and apparently it is necessary for us to adopt this sort of tactics.

But, in any event, as manager of Detroit, I should think you would have the interests of the company sufficiently at heart to do something aggressive to offset this condition. Why don't you run your show in such a manner that Thompson would be ahead to induce you to work for them instead of for Century, and make your terminal more profitable and satisfactory than any other terminal that Century has, inasmuch as Detroit is the best source of traffic that we enjoy.

Get after this situation right now, and let me hear from you what has been done about it.

Yours very truly,

CENTURY AIR LINES (INC.),  
By W. F. BLISS.

In the face of this, this man E. L. Cord has the audacity to send out a statement to the press. Here it is:

E. L. Cord clarifies pilot controversy in patriotic interview.

He refers to himself as "E. L. Cord, president of Century Air Lines (Inc.)," the same company referred to in the letter I have just read, instructing their manager to employ thugs to beat up people. I suppose that was for patriotic reasons.

In other words, this low type of citizen who advocates the employment of thugs to do violence is now trying to get profits by employing scabs and hiding it all in a patriotic appeal. He says that his labor troubles are the result of "anarchistic activities," and he refers to his pilots as "reds." When he says that, he knows that he is making a deliberate, vicious, and malicious false statement. Gentlemen, over 50 per cent of the pilots referred to as "reds" by this miserable person are ex-service men who served as flyers in our Army during the World War and rendered actual flying service for their country. Forty-five per cent of the pilots in the pilots' organization are now members of and affiliated with the reserve forces of the United States Army or Navy. [Applause.]

Among the pilots now on strike are such boys as Eddie Hamilton, Dean Burford, Duke Skoning, Bledsoe Payne, Kenneth Cool, C. H. Thomas, Wheaton, James Benedict, Paul Meng, and others, all veterans of the war. Because they refused to work under indecent conditions, which would impair the safety of the public, he refers to them as "reds." They did not go on strike. They were locked out after they had agreed to arbitration. They were discharged by this same Cord after he went back on his own word to arbitrate. Mr. Cord has absolutely no regard for the truth. He mailed a copy of this "patriotic interview" to every Member of Congress. He said, among other misstatements:

The impression has been given that the readjustment in pilots' compensation on the Middle Western lines reduces them to only \$150 per month. This is not true.

Gentlemen, that statement was made by Mr. Cord himself when a committee of the pilots conferred with him on Sunday, January 31, 1932, in Mr. Cord's own office, in Chicago, Ill. The committee consisted of five, and I will nail his lie right now. This committee consisted of Messrs. Dean Burford, Eddie Hamilton, A. B. Thomas, Duke Skoning, and R. Williams. Two of these gentlemen are in the gallery this minute. Those men represented the pilots. They went there and Mr. Cord told those five men, who are ready to face him any time, anywhere, and who are ready to testify under oath, that he first suggested a reduction of 40 per cent, and that eventually he was going "to take the romance out of aviation" and bring them down to \$150 a month; and yet he has the audacity to send out this "patriotic interview," as he calls it. There is not a meaner employer of scab labor in the entire United States than this man, who disregards the truth and calls it a "patriotic interview."



Do you know what he offered the boys? Three dollars an hour for day flying and \$5 an hour for night flying. Suppose a boy is on a 2-hour or a 3-hour flight, he would get \$9 for that day. He would have to lay over at the terminal until the next day and then come back on the third day, and if that does not make it less than \$6 a day I do not know what does. If he is on a three or four hour night flight, according to the regulations of the Department of Commerce, he can not fly back the next day. Imagine attempting to have a pilot fly four hours every night.

The regulations of our Department of Commerce would not permit any such condition, and this man comes before a committee of Congress, criticizes the Post Office Department, criticizes existing contracts, and says he can do the same work for 50 per cent less, and he figures the 50 per cent less by taking it out of wages. He went from Washington with the idea that we were going to enact special legislation for his discredited company. In all likelihood we would have enacted legislation if an exposure had not been made on the eve of consideration of his proposition. He is known now—and his company is known now—they are not the kind of men and company to intrust the development of aviation.

He said before the committee that he had no opportunity to bid. I have here seven contracts that were opened since he has been operating, in which he or his company did not bid. Why? Again, a matter of truthfulness. I think the gentleman from New York, Mr. MEAD, will bear me out in that.

If the Cord Corporation was really interested in aviation in 1927, as they state on page 369, why did they not bid on the following routes:

No. 27, Bay City-Chicago, established July 17, 1928.

No. 28, St. Louis-Omaha, established May 1, 1929.

No. 29, New Orleans-Houston, established January 23, 1929.

No. 30, Chicago-Atlanta, established November 19, 1928.

No. 32, Pasco-Seattle, established September 15, 1929.

No experience was required of the bidders on any of these routes, although it may have been a factor in making the award between two equally low bids. Six months' experience was required of bidders on the following:

No. 33, Atlanta-Los Angeles, established October 15, 1930.

No. 34, New York-Los Angeles, established October 25, 1930.

The Cord Corporation calls attention to these two routes, but has never said that it wished to bid on them at the time they were ready for installation. At the time it had never flown an airplane over a line of its own and did not on its own showing until March 23, 1931.

To give you an idea of how unsafe it is for any passenger to travel on the Century Line planes at this time, the man at St. Louis who is in charge of checking the planes as they come in, that is, as the pilot leaves the plane, checks the oil, the fuel, the controls and the entire plane, is working 17 hours a day, and he had no assistants. That was one of the causes of the protest of the pilots. Since the strike those conditions have been changed in St. Louis, only during the lockout. Of course they expect to go back on the 17-hour basis later.

Pilots insist on having good mechanics. That, too, was a part of the protest of the pilots, that the Century Air Lines were paying assistant mechanics \$60 a month and senior mechanics \$100 or \$110 a month and overworking those men. I do not need to tell my colleagues how skilled, accurate, and how careful must be the work on the motors and the rigging of the planes. As compared with the prevailing rate for similar skilled work, on other operating companies, it was 30 or 40 per cent less. It was at that time that the pilots protested to the company, and since then there has been some temporary change, only during the lockout, in the hope of beclouding the issue.

I submit that we can not, in this early stage of development of aviation, permit anyone to obtain Government contracts who plans to operate his company in this manner. I hope that I express the sense of this House when I say

that we shall expect and insist that all operators of airplane companies having contracts with the Government shall operate their planes safely and skillfully and shall treat their pilots and labor decently, in accordance with the compensation we are paying them. [Applause.]

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman include in his statement the wages paid by different organizations operating under contracts with the Government, and also to pilots and mechanics?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; I shall be very glad to do so, and I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

*Pilot's hours and pay*

Air mail carrier	Hours per month	Pay per month
Pan American, Caribbean division	80	\$835
Boeing, Chicago-Cheyenne	81	756
Pan American, Mexican division	75	650
Western Air Express	105	625
Colonial	105	625
National parks	85	550-625
Varney Air Line	85	575
Eastern Air Transport	85	575-600
National Air Transport, Chicago-Dallas	85	575
Cord Corporation <sup>1</sup>	70	210

<sup>1</sup> Pay \$3 per hour; \$5 per hour for night flying, but does not do any night flying because Department of Commerce will not approve inexperienced pilots for night duty.

The above will indicate immediately the rates paid by reputable operating companies and the rate offered by the Century Air Lines when the present trouble started.

Now this matter of wages, gentlemen, was brought up in the Committee on Appropriations and the figures which I have just quoted are corroborated by the Postmaster General and will be found on pages 288 and 289 of the hearings before the subcommittee having charge of this bill. Let me read just one or two lines which tell the traffic story:

Mr. THATCHER. You say that they pay [salaries paid pilots by Cord Corporation] the pilots less than the others are being paid?

Mr. BROWN. What was the last figure that they offered their pilots?

Mr. GLOVER. From \$200 to \$250 a month; \$250 was the maximum.

Mr. THATCHER. What is the average?

Mr. BROWN. The average paid to the air mail pilot is about \$600 a month. It runs from \$500 to \$700.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not think \$600 a month is too much.

Mr. BROWN. I do not, gentlemen. I have been around with them quite a bit.

Mr. PARSONS. I think that will be very interesting to the membership.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Now, please do not get the idea that I am oversentimental in consideration of the pilots. Before we permit a man to take command of a ship at sea, we require that he must have many years' experience, must have served an apprenticeship, must have served as third mate, second mate, and first mate, before he gets a skipper's license. With the present development of steam and the art of shipbuilding, the responsibility is not as great as it was years ago, although the responsibility is great. We must take every precaution in the case of heavier-than-air planes. Flying is still in its infancy. The responsibility of a pilot, with 10 or 12 passengers, is enormous. He must navigate, besides piloting the plane; he must attend to the motors, watch his fuel, oil, temperature of motors, should be well trained, and understand meteorology. To take underpaid, inexperienced men or boys who have just obtained their license, as the Century would like to do, and put them in control of passenger planes, I say is unsafe. It is not only unsafe to the people who travel in the air but it is unsafe to the people below, and we ought to put a stop to it immediately. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely interested in the post-office section of this bill and as a member of



the House Post Office and Post Roads Committee, I have a number of amendments which I shall take up under the 5-minute rule. There are a number of matters, however, that I would like to discuss with you right now.

Following the discussion of my distinguished colleague from New York concerning the air mail situation, let me say that on to-morrow our committee will begin hearings in connection with the forming of a new air mail policy. The Comptroller General has criticized the present policy and a great many Members in the House have evidenced an interest in this important question.

The two matters which I desire to discuss with you affect the application of the rule which has been adopted with every appropriation bill passed up to this time. That rule pertains to promotions and automatic increases in salaries. I want to impress upon you the fact that the situation as it applies to the Post Office Department in the field service is entirely different from the departmental service here in Washington.

The amendments which I will offer in connection with that particular feature of the bill are as follows: First, in order to make more certain the intent of Congress in requiring the department to fill vacancies by appointing substitutes and to prevent, if possible, any excuse for defeating the purpose of the legislation by a technicality I will suggest this amendment in line 25, on page 67:

Or when substitutes are employed regularly to the extent of 44 hours a week.

The second amendment I will offer on page 66 will add another proviso, the language of which is as follows:

This limitation on promotions shall not apply to any postal employee receiving \$2,000 or less annually.

The facts in connection with the suspension of automatic promotions are as follows: There are 11,586 employees in the first and second class post offices affected by this amendment. The amount saved by depriving them of their annual increase in salary amounts to approximately \$1,000,000. The men affected for the most part are married, with consequent family responsibilities. They are scattered all over the country in every first and second class post office. The average length of service of the men affected by this amendment, whose salaries would be reduced unless we adopt the amendments, are about eight years, most of that time as substitutes, during which their salary was very, very meager.

In a letter from one of the representatives of the postal groups this matter is explained more clearly than I can possibly hope to explain it to you. Therefore, with your indulgence I will read the letter. This letter was addressed to me as chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and also to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. BYRNS].

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER,  
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1932.

HON. JAMES M. MEAD AND JOSEPH W. BYRNS,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: In behalf of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, I am asking that no limitation be placed in the postal appropriation bill on promotions or appointments in the postal field service for the next fiscal year.

May I suggest that you incorporate the following proviso into the bill to continue the automatic salary promotions:

"Provided, That this limitation on promotions shall not apply to any postal employee receiving \$2,000 or less annually."

There are valid reasons for this suggestion, which I herewith respectfully call to your attention. The salary progression of post-office clerks and city letter carriers from an entrance grade of \$1,700 annually to the top grade at \$2,100 is fixed by a law which stipulates that they be promoted successively \$100 each year, contingent upon satisfactory service. There are approximately 7,000 clerks and 4,400 city letter carriers in these four automatic salary grades at present. Most of them worked five years or longer as substitutes before appointment to the regular force at \$1,700, which means they have been in the service at least eight or nine years. This period is in reality the employees' apprenticeship. For the most part, they are family men with the consequent responsibilities. To deprive them now of earned promotions would be expensive economy—resulting in a very small money saving and a large loss in service morale.

It sounds impressive to say that Congress will stop all promotions as an economy measure. There may be cases where this can be justified. Yet in this instance there would be a breach of con-

tract on the part of the Government and the economy is aimed directly at the lowest-paid groups—those least able to stand it.

The total saving effected by denying these earned promotions is approximately \$1,000,000, which is to be withheld from 11,000 wage earners scattered throughout the country, and which ordinarily would be spent in the usual channels of trade. In view of the billions appropriated by Congress to stimulate business, it is rather petty to now suspend this legitimate expenditure in the form of earned wages and increased purchasing power. Congress should not be put in the position of stimulating only big business and throttling little individuals.

President Hoover has called attention to the importance of dissipating fear and restoring public confidence as an aid to economic recovery. The suspension of the earned promotions of men receiving \$2,000 or less annually—men who have been in the public service for seven or eight years—is not calculated to establish confidence and security among the postal employees. It is certain to have the reverse effect and to this extent retard the reconstruction program. If every dollar hoarded means a destruction of from \$5 to \$10 of credit, as the President states, then withholding these promotions is equivalent to governmental hoarding at the expense of a low-wage group and can not be defended morally or economically.

There is another phase of the proposed legislative limitation that is of great importance to 25,000 substitute post-office clerks and city carriers. I refer to the restriction on the filling of vacancies which will likely prevent appointments of substitutes to regular positions throughout the next fiscal year. Any such policy in the field Postal Service would be disastrous and manifestly unfair to the substitutes.

Postal work must be performed daily without delay. It can not await a return of prosperity. If a substitute is required to do the work of a regular clerk or carrier at a lower rate of pay—as would be the case—it means a lowering of wage standards. It is true there would be a money saving by this practice, but it would be another breach of faith and a further hardship upon the substitutes. For the substitute would have the work and responsibility of a regular without the pay or leave privileges and the benefit of other protective laws.

Post-office substitute employees, numbering 23,000 in all, are now undergoing severe trials. Many of them are dependent upon the charitable donations of their associates. If no vacancies are to be filled until July 1, 1933, it means a continuation of this present very bad condition, which is due to a large extent to restrictive administrative policies of the Post Office Department. The substitutes did not benefit as they should from the 44-hour week law enacted at the last session of Congress. Instead of a 4-hour Saturday, as Congress intended, we have regular clerks in Chicago, Newark, and other large offices working six hours on Saturdays and who then are required to take two hours off during the week when the time is of no value to them. This perversion of the law affects the substitutes adversely.

An accurate picture of the general substitute-employment situation was personally brought to your attention in Nashville last November by a delegation of post-office substitutes. Since then, except for the extra Christmas work, these conditions have grown steadily worse.

The present departmental policy is against filling vacancies, and, inasmuch as this is wrong in principle, as we see it, it should not be sanctioned now by Congressional action. If this is done there will be a tightening up of this restrictive administrative policy that will prevent the appointment of substitutes for the next 17 months.

Furthermore, it implies there is little expectation of an early business revival as the result of the costly reconstruction measures passed by Congress, despite public protestations to the contrary. For, if postal vacancies are not to be filled for 17 months, this indicates a distressing lack of confidence on the part of Congress in the efficacy of its remedial measures for economic stimulation.

For the reasons herein stated I sincerely hope that the House Appropriations Committee will not include in the postal appropriation bill any restriction on filling vacancies in the field service, and also modify the provision limiting promotions to exclude those employees receiving \$2,000 or less annually.

Very sincerely yours,

THOS. F. FLAHERTY,

Secretary-Treasurer National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want you men to consider this matter very seriously before you vote upon these amendments. I want you to consider the pathetic plight of men who for the last 5, 6, 7, or 8 years have been reporting every day and every night to the large post offices throughout the country. Many of them have been given one hour or one day and in some cases, perhaps several days' work each week. They have reported and reported, day in and day out, year in and year out, and if any of those men were fortunate enough to have secured a regular appointment within the last two or three years this rule aims to penalize them.

The lowest-salaried men in the Postal Service, those who were substitute clerks and carriers until the last two or three years, and the laborers who are now in the service, are the only ones to be punished by the application of this rule.



The bill indicates very clearly that the postmasters, assistant postmasters, supervisors, and others in supervisory positions are to be exempt, but it shall apply with undue severity, to the lowest-paid men in the Postal Service. I sincerely hope the amendments I shall offer at the proper time will be adopted by the committee and the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

I do not wish it to be understood that I hold any brief for the Cord Co., concerning which the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] spoke a few minutes ago and about which he made quite a bitter speech a few days ago. I will say, however, that Mr. Cord and his associates, who appeared with him before our committee, impressed me very much not only with their reliability but their sincerity. Whether or not they could make the contract under which they proposed to carry the air mail, both foreign and domestic, at practically half the amount we are now paying, I am not able to say, and the committee did not have time to make the investigation which would be necessary in order that it might be informed on that matter, but I do hope and believe that the testimony they gave before our committee will eventuate in a large saving to the Government of the United States on existing contracts for carrying the air mail.

It is only fair, I think, to submit to this Congress a letter that I received from Mr. Cord, dated February 26, which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 26, 1932.

Hon. WILL R. WOOD,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WOOD: Referring to the statements made by Mr. LaGuardia on the floor of the House some days ago in which he charged me, personally, with beating down of pilots' wages to a point of \$125 to \$150 a month and which Mr. LaGuardia stated was less than that earned by the truck drivers in New York, and to his statement that our airplanes were unsafe and now operated by inefficient and incapable pilots, I beg to advise that our present scale of pay permits the pilot to earn from \$300 to \$400 per month; that the ability of our pilots is determined by the Department of Commerce and that all of them are duly authorized to fly transport ships by that department and are individually inspected by the inspectors of that department before any passengers are permitted to be carried. Our midwestern lines, the lines to which Mr. LaGuardia referred, are now being operated by 17 pilots who have had an experience from 1,100 to 8,800 hours each, as certified by the department license they carry. The department requires only 200 hours' experience.

I attach copies of two articles written and run in the Los Angeles Times as to the situation on the Pacific coast, showing conclusively that malicious attempts have been made to destroy a legitimate business.

For your information, these air lines were started in the early part of 1931, when few new projects were being attempted. These lines have carried more than 25 per cent of all the passengers who have ridden by air in America since their inception. These lines directly employ nearly 400 people and consume vast amounts of raw materials. For instance, the gasoline consumption alone amounts to 10,000 gallons per day.

The articles in the Los Angeles Times show conclusively the confidence that most of our employees have in us.

Very truly yours,

E. L. CORD.

This is from the Los Angeles Times of February 22:

AIR LINE PILOTS HIT UNION RULE—ORDER TO REPUDIATE FAITH IN CORD TO BE IGNORED—BENWAY, CENTURY-PACIFIC VETERAN, CITES AMITY—EFFORT TO FORCE ISSUE INTO CONGRESS REVEALED

Demands were made yesterday from the Chicago headquarters of the Airline Pilots' Association, branch of the American Federation of Labor, that local pilots of Century-Pacific Airlines repudiate the statement they issued here last Saturday expressing satisfaction with wage and working conditions and confidence in E. L. Cord, backer of Century-Pacific.

The demand, according to E. L. Benway, veteran air skipper, and until yesterday acting chairman of the association's executive council in Century-Pacific, will be ignored.

#### SUGGESTIONS CITED

Benway announced he resigned yesterday from the executive post in the association's Century-Pacific membership.

At the same time he revealed that the Chicago headquarters of the association have made demands on the local flyers which he termed "rank attempts to get us to bite the hand that's feeding us."

"The association during the past few days has attempted to make the Century pilots fight Mr. Cord," Benway explained.

"We were told that as members of the association we must wire our congressional Representatives in Washington and 'knock' Mr. Cord and Century."

#### DUE TO CHICAGO ROW

"The way it looked to most of us is that the association is trying to 'cut Mr. Cord's throat' so that Century-Pacific will be unable to get any of the air mail contracts the 'big three' are dividing in Washington.

"We don't want to be traitors to a group, but why should we bite the hand that's feeding us, and double-cross our employers because of some association's demand?"

The local fight with union forces, as represented by the association, resulted from 21 Century pilots being discharged from the Chicago line, also controlled by Cord, because they protested a salary cut.

#### EXPRESS CONFIDENCE

"Perhaps there was a mistake made in cutting the Chicago boys, but that undoubtedly would have been straightened out if the union had not stepped in and gotten 'tough' about the matter," declared Benway.

"And now the association is trying to push us into a battle. We don't want to battle; we are satisfied and our employers are gentlemen trying to do the right thing."

"We issued that statement Saturday expressing our confidence and satisfaction and we intend to stick by it."

Nineteen of the thirty-one Century-Pacific pilots signed the statement. It was learned that all but one flyer on the line belong to the association.

#### FEW MAY RESIGN

Five or six of those who did not sign may resign from the company, it was indicated yesterday.

The balance of the pilots who did not sign will follow with the majority, according to those in touch with the situation.

The Airline Pilots' Association was formed last spring for the purpose of binding skyline skippers together professionally, but with no indication that it intended to become a labor organization.

A charter of the American Federation of Labor was granted to it quietly last December. Many of the pilot members, prior to the Chicago tiff, during which unionism and its methods of force and picketing first cropped out, revealed they were unaware that the American Federation of Labor had become involved in the Nation's latest mode of transportation.

Then there is another item in the Times of February 23, which reads as follows:

[Los Angeles Times, morning, February 23, 1932]

UNION SUSPENDS AIR-LINE PILOTS—NINETEEN AT LOCAL AIRPORT TELEGRAPHED NOTICE—ACTION INDICATES OUSTER BY FEDERATION OF LABOR—CENTURY-PACIFIC EMPLOYEES STAND BY COMPANY

Suspension of 19 of the 26 pilots of Century-Pacific Airlines from the Airline Pilots' Association, aeronautical arm of the American Federation of Labor, was revealed here yesterday in a telegraphic notice filed from Chicago union air headquarters and signed by the Central Pilots' Executive Council of the association.

The notice resulted from the 19 local pilots going on record here in an expression of confidence in E. L. Cord, backer of the Pacific Coast group and of Century Airlines of the Middle West, and pointing out their satisfaction over Century-Pacific wage and operating conditions.

#### PILOTS DEFTY UNION

Defying the Chicago union forces which, some of the pilots declared, tried to force them to wire derogatory statements to Washington that would reflect on Cord and Century-Pacific in its efforts to obtain air mail contracts, the local pilot group refused to repudiate their official statement supporting their employers and the company.

The local situation was precipitated by the labor union in Chicago involving Cord's Century Airlines. Pilots on the middle-western line were discharged when they objected to a salary reduction.

Stepping into the situation with usual union tactics, the Airline Pilots' Association attempted to cultivate strife in the ranks of the local organization. It was revealed that the supposedly professional association was actually a branch of the national labor-union organization and its purposes and activities were brought to light.

#### TO BE EXPELLED

With receipt of the suspension notice yesterday—which, it was pointed out in the telegram, means that the pilots will be expelled as soon as the association can get its board of directors together—the local situation was clarified.

"This means that the 19 men who stood by us are out of the association of their own volition, because they realized that to stand by their company probably would mean losing membership in the association," it was said by O. R. Fuller, president of Century-Pacific.

"The remainder of the 26 men will have to quit the union or quit the company is our understanding of the ultimatum sent them by the union."

"Century-Pacific will not interfere with them. It is their own problem."

"We have been fair to all our men and their expression of confidence in us and the company is indicative of their treatment."



"A fight by other interests to monopolize air-mail contracts evidently has resulted in the union forces being used as a tool to drag our pilots here into a situation in which they are not involved."

I thought it was only fair that the other side of this proposition should be stated. I know nothing about the merits or demerits of the fight that precipitated this trouble. I do know, and many of you know, that the racketeers and the plug-uglies in Chicago, as well as in many other cities, require and deem it absolutely essential that this corporation have protection for its property, whether that property be on the ground or in the air, and there is abundant proof that attempts have been made to destroy such property.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me state that I can not yield to anyone for any purpose until after I shall have finished making my remarks. When I am through, if I have some time left and if I feel so inclined, I may then yield for questions.

On last Thursday the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] saw fit to make a personal attack on me from the floor of the House. His remarks, as revised and extended by him, are recorded on pages 4863 to 4869, inclusive, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published for that day (February 25, 1932). He is a veteran of six successive Congresses, and in addition to having challenged me to combat he has also chosen the weapon—"mud pies." I hope to be able to sling them with as good aim and telling results as he has done himself. He claimed to be displeased at what I had said in a speech before this body on February 19. At that time I promised to reply to him one day during this week. I also promised to prove to you that I made no statement here on Friday, February 19, that is not absolutely true.

In the first place I wish to say to this self-appointed regulator of my conduct that little do I care what he thinks or says concerning me or my party. He hails from Massachusetts. I suppose his ancestors landed on Plymouth Rock. It is a great pity that Plymouth Rock did not land on him instead of permitting his ancestors to land on it. I do not believe he made his attack upon me on account of what I said, but I am rather inclined to the opinion that it was because I had the temerity to speak at all.

Another reason why he assailed me is probably due to my forgetfulness. I forgot to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, my self-appointed guardian, if I might have the privilege of addressing the House. But the straw that broke the camel's back, perhaps, was the introduction into the RECORD by me of a short but timely editorial clipped from a newspaper published in my district.

My speech of February 19 and the editorial referred to, which was extended in the RECORD by unanimous consent, consumed a page and a quarter of space in the daily issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is the only space I have used since Christmas, despite the fact that others have talked almost daily, and despite the further fact that a Member of the other party in another body used 160 pages of space on one occasion at a cost to the Government of approximately \$8,000.

I am well acquainted with the opinion of the gentleman from Massachusetts to the effect that a new Member of Congress should be seen and not heard, but I know of no rule of the House on which he can base this opinion. His attitude in the matter is dictatorial and undemocratic. He is notorious for his matchless egoism and conceit. His arrogance is inexcusable, and his pernicious activity on the floor of this House invites attention to his intolerance.

I wish to advise the gentleman from Massachusetts—and any others who believe as he does—that so long as I shall hold a commission from the Governor of the sovereign State of Georgia to represent the people of a great congressional district in this House of Representatives that I shall avail myself of the privilege of addressing the House when I feel inclined to do so. Before coming here I had been elected by my people to municipal, county, and State offices. I was

sent here to represent the people of the first congressional district of Georgia in the Congress of the United States. My rights and privileges here are equal to those of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I shall continue to forget to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts for permission to address you. I also reserve the right to ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD such documents as I may choose to have so recorded.

In this connection I will state for the benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts that if some newspaper in the country will publish an editorial concerning him and his service, and will base the editorial on facts, I will gladly ask that it, too, be extended in the RECORD.

The gentleman from Massachusetts refers to me as a new star in the legislative firmament, a new leader in Congress, and he speaks of the beginning of my career in statesmanship. In reply I want it distinctly understood that I make no claims to greatness. I am not a star in any kind of a firmament. I am not a leader. If I were leading this group, we would be traveling in a direction other than the one pointed out by the occupant of the White House and his official spokesman.

Before leaving this phase of my subject, however, I want to say that I prefer to be here in the early morning of my career rather than in its late evening, as I understand is the case with the gentleman from Massachusetts. I am told that great rumblings are already being heard in his district which indicate that he is soon to be taken out of the picture, feet foremost, and pointing toward "the rising of the sun."

I was almost moved to tears as I listened to the Republican gentleman from Massachusetts wax eloquent in his defense of my party. What I have had to say about my Democratic colleagues and what I shall say of them in the future is purely a family affair. It is something that should not concern the gentleman from Massachusetts and I do not believe him to be sincere when he claims that it does concern him.

May I pause at this point long enough to ask a question: When did the Democratic Party reach the point in its existence that it would request—or even be willing to permit—a Down-Easter Republican aristocrat from Massachusetts to defend it against any charge? When that time comes I will quit the party.

The gentleman from Massachusetts questioned my statement that other Democrats are thinking as I think and that some of them are beginning to talk as I talk. To prove the truthfulness of that statement, I refer you to that manly "broadside" delivered two days later by no less a person than that peerless Democrat, Hon. JOHN N. GARNER, the Speaker of this House.

With this off my chest, I come to the main issue. The truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth is simply this: The gentleman from Massachusetts is disturbed about what I had to say with reference to the President's attitude toward the relief of our distressed people, the millions of men, women, and children, American born, who are loyal to a flag that is emblematic of liberty, freedom, and justice and has waved over the land of the free and the home of the brave for more than 150 years, and whose Government should be of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Am I to be blamed because a system of government of the people by commissions and for the privileged classes and foreigners has not met with the approval of the people? Have I distorted the facts in saying "our President proclaimed from the housetops that the Government should not contribute \$1 for relief?" If I have, please inform me in which of his utterances he has ever taken a different position. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts make you believe that the American Red Cross is an official agency of the United States and that the Government can claim credit for its activities, and at the same time state to you that a call from this great organization is heeded by the people as a moral obligation upon their voluntary generosity?

In 1921 there was pending a resolution to appropriate \$20,000,000 to buy food for people; not Americans, not



people who had a right to look to our Government for assistance, but people who were living in Russia. Mr. Hoover, who was then the Secretary of Commerce, said:

Public charity is not to be an avenue through which this problem can be solved.

Again he said:

It does not look to be a very great strain on the population to take \$20,000,000 for a purpose of this kind.

But listen to him in December, 1930, nine years later, after he has become the country's Chief Executive, and when American women and children are hungry and in want:

In order that the Government may meet its full obligations toward our countrymen in distress through no fault of their own, I recommend that an appropriation should be made to the Department of Agriculture to be loaned for the purpose of seed and feed for animals. Its application should, as hitherto in such loans, be limited to a gross amount to any one individual and secured upon the crop. The Red Cross can relieve the cases of individual distress by the sympathetic assistance of our people.

The phraseology of the legislation itself limited the use of the money thus loaned for the purpose of buying seed and feed for work animals. No animals were included but horses, mules, oxen, and asses. Not one dime of the money could be legally spent for feed for the milch cow. None of it could be used in the purchase of feed for swine. Not a penny could be used in raising poultry. Nothing was authorized to buy feed for the faithful dog; and if, perchance, the borrower used a portion of the loan for the purpose of buying human food for his overworked wife or his undernourished children, he subjected himself to trial and the payment of a fine of a thousand dollars.

The recommendation of the President for an appropriation to be made to the Department of Agriculture to be loaned for the purpose of buying seed and feed for animals was not a recommendation for relief of the hungry Americans who needed human food, not feed for animals.

I still maintain that I did not misrepresent the attitude of the President in my remarks of February 19, and what I said then I reiterate now, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I have had placed to-day on the Clerk's desk a petition asking for the discharge of the Committee on Agriculture from consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 60, authorizing the Federal Farm Board to turn over to the American Red Cross 40,000,000 bushels of wheat to be processed into flour by the Red Cross and distributed throughout the land wherever there is want or undernourishment.

There is no need for this to be a partisan issue. I want to give an opportunity to every Member of the House, Democrats and Republicans, to sign this petition and turn the Government-owned wheat, or at least a part of it, over to the Red Cross.

The wheat now owned and controlled by the Government costs the taxpayers of America 15 cents a bushel per year for storage or \$6,000,000 for this 40,000,000 bushels of wheat referred to in Senate Joint Resolution 60, introduced by Senators CAPPER and WHEELER, or \$24,000,000 for storage per year for all the wheat owned by the Government.

Many of us in the House of Representatives—most of us, in fact, Republicans and Democrats alike—will go back to our constituents this fall and tell them that we have voted billions to relieve corporations, to relieve the railroads and banks and insurance companies, but we will be forced to admit under political pressure that we have done almost nothing to relieve the distress, the hunger, and the undernourishment among the hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of American citizens who are unemployed through no fault of their own. We voted for a moratorium to relieve the economic and financial situation in Germany and other foreign countries. How can we consistently go home to our own constituents, many of whom are suffering from malnutrition and are hungry, and ignore the urgent needs of our own people who ask for bread from the Federal Government and are given a stone?

For the Federal Government in this emergency to donate its own wheat to relieve millions of hungry American men, women, and children is not a dole. That is no unemployment insurance or placing a premium on idleness. It is the duty of all government in great emergencies to feed their own people. It would be monstrous to call that fundamental responsibility a dole. It comes before and beyond the Constitution and is the reason for the Government itself. We must provide in great national crises for the welfare, health, and lives of the American people. The Congress in 1921 appropriated \$20,000,000 for foodstuffs to relieve the starving Russian people, and the House passed a bill in 1924 by a 2 to 1 vote to provide foodstuffs for the hungry German women and children. Can we consistently continue to ignore the plight of our own people? I believe, my colleagues, that I am rendering a political service to every Member of this House by giving him or her an opportunity to sign the petition at the desk, asking for the discharge of the Committee on Agriculture, irrespective of partisanship, to show that you realize that there is undernourishment, hunger, and destitution in America and that the Congress of the United States is not deaf, dumb, and blind to the suffering and privation of millions of unemployed American citizens.

Let me say to those Members of the House who may be reluctant to sign any kind of a petition that the rule for discharge of committees is a rule of the House. You may not have voted for the rule, or you may not have liked it, but it is just as much of a rule to-day as any other rule of the House of Representatives. Every other legislative body in the world has some sort of a workable rule to control and discharge committees, and properly so; otherwise there would be no representative government, as the committees become the masters instead of the servants of the House. So there should be no fear on the part of any Member of the House that he or she is doing anything irregular or against the party organization or even contrary to the existing rules of the House.

I rose for the single purpose of announcing, free from partisanship of any kind, that the petition to discharge the Committee on Agriculture of Senate Joint Resolution 60, which passed the Senate two months ago by a unanimous vote, is now on the desk, and those of you who believe that there is hunger in the land and that the American people in this affliction are entitled to some consideration at the hands of the Government and wish to cast a vote in this emergency to help relieve the hungry and destitute without expense to the taxpayers—as a matter of fact, saving \$6,000,000 to the taxpayers—you have that opportunity by signing the petition at the Clerk's desk.

I want you to sign the petition on its merits, and I can assure you that if you go home this fall and tell your people that you have simply voted to relieve big corporations, railroads, and banks, as we all have done, and have ignored the suffering and undernourishment among our own people and have failed to do anything at all by your voice or vote or signature to relieve human misery in America, we will all be held strictly accountable by our constituents, and properly so. [Applause.]

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LARSEN].

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take the time allotted me to discuss the merits or the demerits of the bill now pending. There has been a great deal said by some gentlemen discussing the air mail service in regard to the proposition made by the Cord Co. for air mail contracts, especially with reference to their offer to render the service at a much lower rate than is now being paid.

Some gentlemen seemed to be impressed with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD] when discussing this matter. The gentleman said that he did not wish to be considered as criticizing the Postmaster General. Well, I think the effect of his remarks is such, when taken literally, as to cause reflection on the administration of the Postmaster General.

Mr. Manning, spokesman for the Cord Co. before the committee, repeatedly said that the policy of the administration



was such that it created a monopoly in favor of certain companies now enjoying contract privileges.

I do not think so, but so far as I am concerned, as compared with the Cord Co., I am in favor of giving monopoly to those who have it, if such it be.

Who is the Cord Co.? I am not here to criticize any member of the Cord Co., except in the capacity in which they placed themselves before the committee considering this legislation. So far as I know, they are all excellent gentlemen, but that does not alter the fact so far as their relation goes, to this matter.

The committee inquired into and discussed the financial responsibility of the Cord Co. I did not hear one word or one question from any member of the committee—and I heard all of the remarks made—except as to financial responsibility. They were shown to be worth more than \$50,000,000. We have a report in the record, filed by Mr. Lyndoh L. Young, attorney for the Cord Corporation, in Washington, and we let him tell us who they are and what they are.

He says that the Cord Co. was organized by Mr. E. L. Cord and Mr. L. B. Manning, and is a corporation with \$56,000,000 assets, \$15,000,000 of which is in cash or its equivalent. He also says that they operate in every one of the 48 States. If it stopped at that it might be all right, but he goes on in the last part of the sentence and says, "as well as in 40 foreign countries." Here is a giant corporation with \$56,000,000 to back it, \$15,000,000 in cash and Government securities, that wants to come in and take contracts from American owned, controlled, and operated companies—small companies with capital of perhaps from one to three million dollars.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. This great concern has been in progress for a number of years, as I understand it, and to-day they want to get this contract. Why was it not possible for them to come in two or three years ago when these other companies were bidding and participate in those bids?

Mr. LARSEN. I think that is a very pertinent question.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Is this the company that wants the contract to Cuba?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes; as I understand. Mr. Cord and Mr. Manning organized in the automobile industry in 1924 with a million and a half dollars. They have now increased the assets of the Cord Corporation to approximately \$56,000,000. They went into airplane construction and operation in 1927, some two or three years before the contracts of which they now complain were made. Of course, they had the privilege of bidding on the contracts when let, and they were let, at least in several instances, to the lowest bidder. There were two important bids, one for the service between New York City and Los Angeles, Calif., and the other from Atlanta, Ga., to Los Angeles. These two big contracts were let nearly two years ago for a period of four years, and no reason appears why they could not have bid on them. Why did they not bid then if they wanted the contracts? They made no bid and made no complaint until December of last year. They never came before the Postmaster General, according to their own statement, until December, 1931. When they came before the committee they said they were willing to carry this mail for approximately half of what the Post Office Department is now paying. Of course, they ought to be able to do that, after the other company has gone out into the undeveloped field and built up a passenger service and established the line. They certainly should be able and willing to make concession and carry the mail for much less than the other company, which has borne the expense of development.

Suppose the Government says to a homesteader, we will give you a lot of land for \$1.25 an acre, and you are to live upon it for three years and make certain improvements, which he necessarily has to make in order to live there. Then suppose that the homesteader has stayed there for two years; do you not think you could find plenty of men who would say to the Government, if you will run this fellow off

and give me the land, I will be willing to pay \$10 an acre for it? The propositions are analagous. They came here and made complaint before this great committee, and the committee questioned only as to financial responsibility—not as to foreign operation and holdings, not as to foreign entanglement, foreign stockholders, or anything else. The Postmaster General has been criticized before the committee and before this Congress because he is not willing to give this Cord Co. the contracts and take them away from the companies now serving.

Mr. ARNOLD. If the gentleman has any information along that line, I would be glad to have him put it into the RECORD.

Mr. LARSEN. I shall read it to the gentleman. He must have the information himself, because it is contained in a letter addressed to Mr. BYRNS, the chairman of this committee, by an attorney who lives in the city of Washington. I read from page 369 of the hearings authorized to be printed by your committee:

The Cord Corporation is operating in 1,186 communities, in every State in the Union, as well as 40 foreign countries, with total assets of approximately \$56,000,000, of which amount approximately \$15,000,000 is in cash and Government securities. Cord Corporation has no bonds, bank loans, or preferred stock. Its net earnings and those of its subsidiaries for the year 1931 will exceed \$4,000,000. The Cord Corporation has a labor pay roll of \$50,000 per day, and at the present time has 10,000 employees. The company's stock is held by approximately 15,000 stockholders residing in each State in the Union and 13 foreign countries.

The record does not show how many of these employees are in the 40 foreign countries, but there must be a large number.

Here is the corporation that comes in and talks about a monopoly—with all of these foreign holdings. It operates in 40 foreign countries and has stockholders in 13 different foreign countries. They come here and plead like babies—talk about giving a monopoly to these American institutions—they are pleading for a monopoly to be given to a half-American, half-foreign corporation—a hybrid. Evidently the gentleman from Illinois did not read this part of the record.

Mr. ARNOLD. Has the gentleman a list of the stockholders of these concerns now carrying the mail, so as to see whether or not there are any foreign stockholders among them?

Mr. LARSEN. I do not think the record shows any such information, but as the gentleman was a member of the committee considering the matter, before he criticizes the department and condemns the Postmaster General, he ought to have secured that himself, and if the gentleman had put it into the record I would now be able to read it to him.

Mr. ARNOLD. Does not the gentleman know that the stock of all of these concerns is dealt with on the New York Stock Exchange and that, of course, stockholders are scattered throughout this country and abroad as well?

Mr. LARSEN. That is the explanation the gentleman from Illinois would give, but it is not the explanation that the attorney for the Cord Corporation gave, and it is not what the record shows. Never mind the stockholders wherever they may reside. I am talking about the business operations of this concern. The transactions on the exchanges did not put the Cord Co. into business in the 40 foreign countries. We might well interest ourselves in the few American concerns who have contract privileges secured in an orderly way under the Constitution of this Government.

How did the Cord Co. make the \$56,000,000 in about six years, with such an insignificant beginning as a million and a half? What do you think of the transactions of a company which makes such progress in the short period from 1924 to 1931? They start out with \$1,500,000 and make \$56,000,000. No wonder industrial labor has nothing but its daily wage! The Postmaster General said one reason he did not want to employ this concern was because they were not properly equipped. They do not have satisfactory men to man the ships; the pilots are underpaid, or words to that effect. First-class pilots are usually paid from



\$600 to \$700 per month, but the Cord Co. pilots are said to receive less than half this amount. First-class pilots are usually Annapolis, West Point, or Kelly Field men, highly trained. This, in part, explains how they made the \$56,000,000. Some of the Members manifest great interest in labor organizations and seem to sympathize with the laboring man. If you are a friend of labor, show it to-morrow when we offer an amendment to this portion of the bill. Let us see just what you think about taking care of labor.

Mr. McMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSEN. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. Are not the pilots of this Cord Corporation now out on strike as a result of the salaries paid them?

Mr. LARSEN. Yes; I understand that is true. One Member said the other day some of them would be striking up in the air.

Now, who is this Mr. Stinson who was killed on one of these Stinson improved planes? The Stinson Airplane Corporation is a part of this Cord Co. Mr. Stinson, the gentleman who was killed, was president of this subsidiary corporation. How did he come to be killed? Because, we are told, he was on a plane that was not properly equipped. It did not have 2-way radios, or Weather Bureau service. They could not ascertain what the weather conditions were in the direction they were traveling. That is one of the most important things in connection with aviation. The Postmaster General does not give any contract unless the company has proper equipment, such as weather reports, 2-way radios, and in most cases automatic pilots and every device that makes for safety for human life.

The ship that fell in California the other day, killing seven passengers, was apparently wrecked simply because it did not have proper equipment. They had no radio and no weather service and underpaid pilots. They were without proper equipment. They should not have undertaken such service, and yet some Members want the Postmaster General to give contracts to companies like that.

There is another important feature to which I wish to call attention, and that is military defense. What is the best second line of defense we can have in the military? Certainly there is none better than up-to-date, well-regulated, commercial aviation. When a man completes military training in any of our governmental military schools at most he never has exceeded a thousand hours' flying experience. Recently I endeavored to help a young man in my district. He had had two years' flying experience in Government service at Panama, but it was disclosed that he had only been in the air approximately 700 hours.

When I went to the authorities of one of these air mail line companies what did I find? They said, "We can not consider him for position of pilot unless he has had 3,000 hours." That is three times as much experience as the Government training afforded him, and at best he could only qualify as copilot. Where did Lindbergh come from? First, perhaps, from Kelly Field, but later, when equipped for oceanic flight, from this identical line of service. Where did he get his training? He got it in the air fields carrying the mails for this country. It is a second line of defense. It is that line of defense which in military emergency means more to this Nation than any other line of defense we could have, unless it be in the Army itself.

One purpose of this speech is to ascertain why the unusual haste of the committee in getting this bill reported out. We went before the committee and told it we understood the Postmaster General when before the Bureau of the Budget asked for \$20,000,000 for air mail service, but that the Budget cut it down to \$19,000,000. The Postmaster General said the Director of the Budget left the impression with him that when that money gave out he could come back and get more. How? By creating a deficit. But no honorable officer could afford to do that. Why? Because the provisions of the Watres Act are such as to prevent it. No officer administering such laws in our country has a right to create a deficit except to meet an unforeseen emergency. This was not unforeseen, because the Postmaster General knew it would not be sufficient. He had just cut down 10 per cent, and he said a \$19,000,000 appropriation would make

him cut 5 per cent more and would not afford sufficient funds to carry out the existing program.

As the chairman knew, we went before the Bureau of the Budget, and the Director informed us they were studying the bill; that they had discussed it with the President, and they were going the next day to see if they could get the President to agree to \$20,000,000, provided their investigation that day warranted it. What happened? That very afternoon, this great committee realizing that we had appeared before the Bureau of the Budget, realizing that three of its own members had been before the Bureau of the Budget, all at once reported out the bill. The subcommittee would not wait. Then the whole committee reported it out before the matter could be wound up by the Bureau of the Budget.

Now, I am not criticizing anybody, but I am just giving you the facts. You are entitled to know them, and I want you to know what happened. This great committee said, "Well, we can not make it twenty million because the Budget has not approved it." I imagine you were all here Saturday afternoon, and if you were I would like to have you contemplate for a minute what members of that great Appropriations Committee did regarding the \$120,000,000 road bill that had not been approved by the Budget. We were voting on roads Saturday afternoon. There are 35 members of that great Committee on Appropriations. They could not vote sufficient air mail appropriation in this bill because the Budget had not approved it, and yet they could only muster 9 men out of 35 who were willing to vote against that \$120,000,000 for roads. Oh, it depends on what it is convenient to do. They are not afraid of the Budget. That is not the trouble. Gentlemen, face the facts. We have a great territory in the Southeast and in the Northwest that now stands greatly in need of air-mail development. Airports have been built at great cost to municipalities and individuals. All over the Northwest, all over the Southeast, all over every section of this country further development is needed. Municipalities have invested millions of dollars in it. Now the committee wants to cut down appropriations. It is the only industry in this country that has been built up during and in spite of the depression, and now they want to butcher it. We will offer an amendment to-morrow, and we want all to vote for it. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN].

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I heartily indorse the action of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] when he asks the membership of this House to sign a petition to take from the Agricultural Committee of this House Senate Joint Resolution No. 60, which provides for the giving, when milled, of 40,000,000 bushels of wheat owned by the Grain Stabilization Corporation. Forty million bushels of wheat when milled will supply bread for 10,000,000 people for one year. In this country we have 354,000,000 bushels of wheat ready to be sold, 154,000,000 bushels of which are owned by the Grain Stabilization Corporation and 200,000,000 bushels of which are owned by private interests. We have in this country 8,000,000 people out of employment. The cost of wheat ownership to the United States Government is \$2,000,000 per month.

Since we convened on the first Monday in December we have been occupied with giving relief to sister nations; dealing with the great problems which confronted the Federal farm loan banks on their bond issues; creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and passing legislation that is expected to release secondary frozen assets in our banking system.

We have been dealing with these problems for business. Five or eight years ago the business of this country would not come and plead with the Congress of the United States for relief, but now we find railroads, financial institutions, industry, and some insurance interests and other interests pleading with the Government of the United States for financial assistance.

Each one of the 435 Members of this House represents a large group of people who are in distress. They are in actual need. They are asking themselves what their Representative



is doing to give them immediate relief. Here is an opportunity to give those people immediate relief in one way.

I am against the doctrine of paternalism; but we are dealing with something that represents an emergency, just as much as we dealt with problems representing emergencies during the period of the war. Just as necessity knows no law, an emergency knows no principle. No law or principle should keep any government from helping those in distress.

My friends, those of us of the old-fashioned type of democracy—and I so classify myself, coming from New England—can put aside our convictions on paternalism, because it is not paternalism when we care for the hungry.

The world has never seen a situation like this. We live in a land of plenty. We have an oversupply of food, an oversupply of fuel, and an oversupply of clothing; yet there are millions of people in distress, crying for the actual necessities of life. In this country, my friends, we have not overproduction, but we have underconsumption. One of the important things needed in our economic life is to devise a proper system of distribution. The country needs sane, social legislation.

I wonder if we realize, my friends, that from Maine to California, and particularly throughout the industrial regions of this country, the citizenship of this country has behaved well during this distress? [Applause.] A high recommendation of the stability of American citizenship. [Applause.] But let us realize that we are sitting on a keg of dynamite. We can not expect too much from human beings. The petition on the Speaker's desk should be signed by 145 Members, the number required under the rules of the House, and Senate Joint Resolution 60 should be passed without delay. On December 11, 1931, I introduced House Joint Resolution 119, covering the same subject.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HAINES].

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, I have not heretofore attempted to address the House, preferring to be a hearer rather than a talker. I also appreciate the fact that as a new Member in this distinguished body I am in a great school of training, and desire to be taught rather than to impress myself upon the Congress. I believe, too, that just as men are obliged to train for any profession by going to preparatory school, college, and university, so must a new man coming into these legislative halls be trained in the fine art of legislating laws. I am not a lawyer, neither a college nor university graduate, and am willing to admit that the parliamentary rules of this body have somewhat confused me, but the more I hear and observe the more I am convinced that this form is the best in legislation.

I am a small business man, not one of the group of larger operators in the field of industry but rather one of that group that is rapidly disappearing, and unless this small group is offered more encouragement and is given more consideration and sympathetic patronage on the part of the masses the foundation structure of our great Nation will be destroyed, for I do believe that our Nation became a great one by reason of the opportunities men have had in the past to establish small business enterprises for themselves. Millions have done this. A few have succeeded and stepped in advance; but the great mass of small merchants and industrialists in every line of endeavor have been able at best to make a livelihood for themselves and those whom God has given to them and who, to me, are the most priceless possessions of all, while a few have been able to lay aside small sums of money to hand to their children and their posterity.

Many of these, which I choose to call the great middle class of our citizenship, have been able to educate their children and by self-denial given their children the advantage of advanced schooling. I doubt not that the great mass of the membership of this Congress come from these homes. The spectacle in this present day, however, differs very much from those of the past in that this great middle class are rapidly being denied the opportunities that our fathers enjoyed through the granting of special privileges and the mergers of all types of business into huge corpora-

tions and chain stores, with advantages very often that will not permit this middle class to continue operating their business or factory. I have noted with much satisfaction the keen interest manifested by every Member of this body for the well-being of our citizenship, and I know that every Member of Congress is intensely interested that our citizenship shall enjoy the blessings of prosperity. Whether it is within the province of Congress to enact legislation that will restore that prosperity I am unable to predict; but I know that my colleagues in this branch of Congress want to do what they believe to be best for all our people. I think the greatest mistake we can make at this moment is to play politics at the expense of human misery, for is not it true, my colleagues, that as a body of legislators we must be united in purpose? I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether the present administration is to blame for the economic ills that now confront us, nor do I care about that. What I am interested in right now is that we shall find some way out of our present difficulty. I do not believe that any of our people are starving, but I do know that many of them are subjects of charity and many of them in dire need and distress at this time. What I am concerned about to-day is that these people shall get back into industry, and when I say this I only repeat what others have expressed on this floor during this present session of Congress.

I know that there are college and university graduates in the bread lines of our Nation, men with finest sensibilities, and this must indeed be humiliating to such, and yet through our present economic structure in this Nation, we have forced many men and women out of industry. I have voted with you to pass measures here aimed at a readjustment of these economic evils but with much misgiving each time, believing that we have not gone to the core of the source of our present difficulties.

To me it is most tragic that we have the great army of unemployed. I will confess to you, Mr. Chairman, that I have no cure for our present trouble, but I do believe that we have not taken into consideration the present and still growing tendency toward mass production and installation of labor-saving machinery in our manufacturing plants with regard to the great army of men and women that such machinery replaces. Machines that make the burdens of labor easier for a human being are fine and I do not want to go on record as opposing these, but I do want you to know that when industry installs a machine that will deny an opportunity for faithful employees, many of whom have been helping the employer amass a fortune, to have employment, it is time that we, in our ambition and great interest for our fellow man, awaken to the great danger that threatens us, and to me it is no surprise that we have this great army of unemployed when I go into the manufacturing plants of our Nation and see what labor-saving machinery and mass production has done to our people.

I can not help but say, Mr. Chairman, that when a machine supplants human hands in industry, and by that act takes bread and butter from the mouths of our people, throws them out of employment, makes them walk from plant to plant hunting a "job," if you please, then it is time, Mr. Chairman, that the machine be made to contribute to the support of those who are denied a livelihood by reason of the machine. This may sound socialistic to you, my colleagues, but I assure you it is not; it is simply a fact that every Member of this Congress will learn if he will go into the factories of to-day and see what machinery has done to eliminate human hands from industry. I believe there is a way out of this, but it will require courage on the part of each one of us and to be intensely interested in providing a way out.

It may be a shorter day and a shorter week. If this can not be accomplished it may even mean setting aside of some of this machinery and go back to the days of yesterday until we do have the problem solved. I represent a great manufacturing district in that it has a diversified industry, and know of what I speak.

Men have come to me telling me that because of the installation of machines—very often one machine doing the work of half a dozen human beings—they were no longer



needed in industry. I have had some men come to me saying that because they had reached an age in excess of 50 they were no longer being considered in industry.

My colleagues, if this be true, then it is time that you and I become interested. My own experience as a manufacturer is that men at 50 are as valuable as men younger, at any rate more dependable as a rule—and at 50 very often the heads of families that need them, perhaps more so than at any time in their history.

I read a year or two ago that in one city in the installation of the dial-telephone system eleven hundred persons were discharged. These had to get into other channels of industry, and if you carry this throughout the Nation one will get an idea of the vast number of persons displaced in this business alone.

This is true largely in every industry. When the machine is installed it usually means unskilled labor and lower wage scales, unless, of course, the machine requires one to be skilled.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope I am not understood as being against improved machinery or labor-saving machinery, for I am not. I know the great strides we have made as a Nation, by reason of the invention and genius of our people, and that making machines has added many thousands to the pay rolls of industry. I realize, too, that much of the unemployment in our country is in the ranks of the unskilled, much of which remains unskilled by reason of no need being developed for them. I really think, Mr. Chairman, that one of the ways for us to solve this employment situation, or rather unemployment, is to stop and right-about face in an investigation to learn more about this great question.

I know what machinery has done to my industry. I am a cigar manufacturer and am qualified to speak about this industry more so than others. In 1910 we had 22,519 registered cigar factories in the United States. In 1922 we had 11,576 and in 1929 only about 6,000.

In this industry I verify my previous statement that the middle-class, smaller business man is being rapidly driven out of industry, for, mark you, Mr. Chairman, many of these cigar factories were not large, but they did offer an opportunity to those who owned them to manufacture and sell their product and have some degree of prosperity. The number of cigars manufactured annually varied very little from 1910 to 1929, in round figures about six and one-half billions. Note, please, while the same quantity of cigars were being manufactured, there was such a large decrease of cigar factories, or more than 16,000. I do not have the figures of the number of men and women less in these 6,000 cigar factories than were employed in the 22,519 factories back in 1910, but I am confident there is a tremendous decrease, and men and women have been thrown out of employment and denied the opportunity to follow a trade they were taught, by reason of machines taking the place of human hands.

It so happens that a man perfected a machine that would make a cigar. The cigar it produces is far from perfect, however, and much inferior to the cigar made by human hands. About 20 per cent of the cigars it does produce are unfit for regular brands and are usually packed under fictitious brands commonly called "seconds." These machines are virtually owned by one concern; at any rate, the American Tobacco Co., which owns the American Cigar Co., also owns the concern manufacturing the cigar machines.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take the time of Congress to go into the history of this machine and what it has done to the cigar industry other than to say that the man whose genius produced this machine is reported to have remarked: "If I had had the least idea of the trouble that machine would cost, it would never have been made." These machines were first being produced in Hanover, Pa., a part of the district I represent. Due to a fire the plant was moved to Brooklyn, N. Y., in March, 1902. The same American Tobacco Co., headed by Mr. James B. Duke, owned cigarette-making machines.

The difference between the latter and the cigar machine is that you can go in the market and buy a cigarette-making

machine but you can not buy a cigar-making machine. These are leased, and the terms of that lease at one time were upon a royalty basis of \$1 per thousand cigars, with a down payment of \$3,500 at installation, with a guaranty that they use the machines 17 years, to buy all their own parts and hire mechanics to keep them in order and in first-class condition, and to pay the royalty upon a minimum basis of 1,000,000 cigars per year. There are probably more than 6,000 of these machines in use right now upon which royalty is being paid.

The economics of the machine, however devastating, are quite simple. Before surveying its wider aspects, let us take a brief look at the affairs of the company which makes the machines. This company is The International Cigar Machinery Co., two-thirds of whose stock is owned by American Machine & Foundry Co., largely owned by the America Tobacco Co., or Duke interests.

With 6,000 machines in use, it can make about \$5,000,000 profit, upon the basis of the rental charges, and now probably one-third of the cigars manufactured are being made on machines.

With the entire production of cigars in the country made on machines it would require about 20,000 machines with an enormous profit, and all at the expense of the men and women in industry; for, if you please, there is no need for the skilled mechanic who was paid up to \$22 per thousand previous to machines supplanting human beings skilled in this trade, whereas the machine builds this cigar for less than \$6 per thousand. Now, what is the result of all this machinery in industry? It has brought down the wage scale in every section where cigarmakers were employed, down to the level of competing with the machine. If I had the time I could give you the entire history and development of the machine and what it has done to the industry; the many, many men and women who have been denied a living wage; the many, many small cigar manufacturers who have been driven from this business; and how that, in doing this, one man, the man who was largely responsible for the machine coming into the cigar industry, amassed a great fortune, and his home on Fifth Avenue remains one of the most perfect, and his young daughter reputed to be the richest young girl in the world. I admire men who can accomplish all this, and do not want to be misunderstood as trying to create a bad feeling toward men who were wise enough to see the possibilities and also to have the courage to undertake that in which they believed; but what I am deeply concerned about is that in other lines of industry the same results have been obtained, and all of this has had a tendency to break down our economic structure for permanency.

I do, however, here indict the American Tobacco Co. for being unfair in their competition and the destructive advertising campaigns they have waged in the newsprint and radio.

Their "spit" campaign was a shame in the eyes of all fair-minded, honest Americans, for this campaign was waged against that group of small manufacturers who never had a prosperous era, but were content to produce quality cigars and sell them to the trade at honest prices. There never was a greater shame cast upon business than that campaign, and for me to discuss this any further is repulsive, as was the advertising to the great group of well-thinking people. One of the greatest evils of our present day is destructive competition, and you will find that the cigar and tobacco jobbers and retailers in this country are the victims of very unfair business ethics, making very little if any profit. We have been deeply interested in the farmer, and do you know, Mr. Chairman, that in Kentucky right now, tobacco is being sold at one-fourth of a cent a pound? My colleague representing a constituency in that State only recently told me that the tobacco was on the hands of these farmers, and they did not know what to do with it and were thinking of using it as a fertilizer.

When I am told that the American Tobacco Co. had profits above \$41,000,000, and that they paid a bonus, above the salary, to Mr. George Hill, of more than \$2,000,000, and when I know that it costs probably 8 cents a pound to grow tobacco, is it any wonder that I am concerned and here charge



bad faith on the part of men using machines largely in the manufacture of their product, for which they have created a national demand?

During all this time these same machine cigar manufacturers, and who produce billions of cigarettes, tell us that they can not stand additional taxation, and if additional taxation is placed upon them, it will reflect in the price they can pay the farmer, and then excite the retailers of this country to the point where they write Members of Congress to oppose additional taxation on cigarettes. Why, Mr. Chairman, two unskilled mechanics and a machine produce 750,000 cigarettes in 10 hours. The cigarettes are packed and every other necessary packing, stamping, and so forth, is done by machinery, so that there is no need for much labor, and during the year 1931 the parent company, the American Tobacco Co., raised the price of cigarettes with no justification whatever, as all raw materials had declined, and if you will take the time to investigate the prices they paid the growers of tobacco you will agree with me that four companies closely interlinked, and who are the only buyers the farmer has for his tobacco, have not kept faith with the farmer any more than they have with men and women in industry.

Mr. Chairman, I have some information taken from trade papers that illustrates clearly some of the evils of the machine supplanting human hands in industry. On February 19, 1931, an extract from Tobacco, a trade publication, I read, headed as follows:

ON COMPLETE MACHINE BASIS

According to a bulletin recently released by the American Cigar Co., that corporation has invested a lot of money in cigar machines. More than \$6,158,750 has been used to place the American Cigar Co. on a complete machine basis and current relative production costs have been reduced thereby as the production has been increased. It is the demand of the concentration in general industrial conditions, and that's all there is to it.

No thought or concern for those displaced in industry is even indicated here.

United States Tobacco Journal, February 16, 1931, carries an item from Garfield, N. J., advising that the American Cigar Co.'s plant at 18 Passaic Street, there, which has been operated there for the past 15 years, will shortly be closed. The work at present handled there will be divided between the plants at Camden and Philadelphia. On June 26, 1930, the Milan branch at Milan, Tenn., the last of the cigar factories operated by hand in the South by this company, received official notification to cease manufacture of cigars. The factory had been opened in 1925, and was the major factor in the growth of the town. This followed the closing of other plants in Kentucky and Tennessee, all because machines had been installed in other plants replacing human hands in industry. An item from Fulton, Ky., under date of February 27, 1930, states that "factory closed down last Tuesday and will move to new location where cigars will be made on machines instead of handmade." In December, 1930, a news item from Tampa, Fla., states that American Cigar Co. moves M. Valle plant to Trenton, N. J., with the statement that "folks who have the interest of the city at heart dislike to see this industry leave."

And so on, Mr. Chairman, I could cite instance after instance where in the industry with which I am most familiar, machinery has played havoc, causing much unemployment. In my own town, where a great many cigars are produced, our people employ all native white Americans, who own 90 per cent of the homes of the community; there is no outside capital employed in this town, local cigar and furniture manufacture supplying employment even during this time of depression. But, Mr. Chairman, in the cigar factories of my community no machines are used, and as a result I have no hesitancy in saying we give more for the money to the smoker and keep human hands employed in industry. I should dread to think what would happen in my home town if the cigar manufacturers would install these machines.

They are patriotic gentlemen, interested in the welfare of their employees, and, Mr. Chairman, if we are to restore prosperity we must employ men and women and not have

them be subjects of charity, and the same soul loyalty to the wage earner must be given as business expects from you and me here in Congress.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress will have the courage to get to the root of our present unemployment. I know it requires courage to do it and that there are those who will frown upon any movement that will disturb the present efficiency in factory production. I believe that what I have cited in my own industry can be paralleled in every other line of manufacture; and while I do not want to say we should tax machinery, we should at least expect that where machines take work away from human hands without an opportunity for them to be reemployed something should be done whereby the machine will be made to contribute to the support of those it has supplanted. I trust, however, that our industrial leaders will be patriotic in this matter and either work more shifts, shorter days and weeks, so that men now unemployed might get back jobs that will enable them to look every man in the eyes without being humiliated by reason of being obliged to go to the board of charity in the local community for food and clothing.

This every red-blooded American is ashamed to do, but let us thank God for the fine group of our American citizens in this land who have been interested in the welfare of their neighbors and who will continue to show their interest in humanity. We have been tackling these problems from the standpoint of helping large corporations, banks, railways, and so forth, now let us manifest the same interest in the American workingman. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago the gentleman from Georgia notified the House that he would reply to some remarks which I had made on the floor of the House. Although I did not hear the whole of his speech, what I did hear showed me that the mountain had labored and brought forth a mouse. There was nothing in his remarks which was worthy of a reply or even worthy of consideration, except one thing. That was so characteristic of the gentleman in his disregard of facts that I want to inform him that instead of being a "Down-East aristocrat" I am a son of the South, and proud of it; that my college cheer is "Rah, rah, night school," and that my trade is that of blacksmith. If he can connect his statements with the facts I would like to have him do so.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Where was the gentleman born?

Mr. UNDERHILL. In Richmond, Va., suh. The gentleman made some remarks the other day, extemporaneously, in which he did better than he did to-day. The remark he made, and to which I refer, was a quotation from an editorial in the Atlanta Constitution, which he said used the language, "To hell with Massachusetts," which he indorsed and in which he concurred.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the people of Georgia subscribe to any such doctrine as that. Massachusetts needs no defense from me, but in all fairness, and in all kindness, too, I do want to show the gentleman what happened in Massachusetts when Georgia was in distress and the Red Cross requested assistance for a stricken people.

In 1927, the year of the great Mississippi flood, at the call of the Red Cross, the citizens of Massachusetts voluntarily subscribed \$812,000 for the relief of the stricken area. In 1926, when his State suffered from a destructive hurricane, Massachusetts again voluntarily raised \$148,000; and in 1928, when the worst hurricane in recent years came along and Florida and Georgia were laid low, Massachusetts subscribed once more almost \$300,000 for relief; and in the drought of 1930, she subscribed \$674,000, a total of very nearly \$2,000,000. Not one single dollar of this amount was spent within the confines of the State of Massachusetts, but every cent went to the stricken area represented, in part, by the gentleman from Georgia.

When the gentleman says, "To hell with Massachusetts," I wonder if he is old enough to think back to the time of Henry W. Grady, when he was editor of that paper—and it was a great paper in his day—and wonder if the remark he attributes to the Constitution is correct. I have some doubt



of it, because he has not said anything which is a fact yet. If they are correct, all I have to say is, "Oh, how are the mighty fallen." In contrast, I quote from the great speech Henry W. Grady, a truly great American, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, made in Boston, Mass., when he said, amid tremendous applause:

Standing hand to hand and clasping hands we should remain united, as we have been for 60 years, citizens of the same country, members of the same Government, united now, and united forever.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one-half minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The House has closed the time for general debate.

Mr. LARSEN. I do not think anybody would object to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is compelled to enforce the rule even though he does not like it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. When the great Speaker, Champ Clark, was Speaker of the House he said anything could be done by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Very true, as stated by the gentleman from Maryland, the House can do anything by unanimous consent, but it does not follow that the Committee of the Whole House can do anything by unanimous consent.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries: Secretary of the Treasury, \$15,000; Under Secretary of the Treasury, \$10,000; three Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury and other personal services in the District of Columbia, \$135,180; in all, \$160,180: *Provided*, That in expending appropriations or portions of appropriations contained in this act for the payment of personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, as amended, with the exception of the Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriations unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed, as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the classification act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law, or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes instead of 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that he may be privileged to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, the administration is getting ready to give to the small banks, especially in rural sections, another punch below the belt. For 10 years these banks have been mercilessly exploited by the big city banks, with the full knowledge and tacit approval of the administration. The plan was to limit the activities of the country banks, make them absolutely subservient to the big city banks, milk them of their liquid assets, and transfer their cash to the great centers of wealth and population, where it could be utilized and manipulated for stock jobbing and piratical financial ventures.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman's flow of eloquence. The gentleman is always interesting, but I understood we were now reading the bill and all remarks should be confined to the bill. I think the gentleman is going rather far afield, and I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his intention to do so?

Mr. LOZIER. It is my intention, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the bill and the policy of the Treasury administration with reference to fiscal matters of the Government which are directly involved in the pending Treasury appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will observe the rules and proceed in order.

Mr. LOZIER. The first step was to persuade the country banks to discontinue lending their funds to the people in their respective communities, and banks were especially warned against making loans to farmers on their lands, live-stock, and farm commodities, on the specious plea that these last-mentioned securities were not liquid, while claiming loans based on stocks and bonds could be quickly converted into cash.

The scheme worked. Under pressure from the big city banks, and yielding to thinly veiled coercion from the Federal Reserve Board, the country banks reluctantly discontinued making loans to their patrons and filled their portfolios with beautifully printed certificates of watered stock, issued by overcapitalized and highly speculative corporations. The cash, Government bonds, and other easily convertible assets were exchanged for these so-called liquid securities. When the exchange had been consummated and the country banks loaded with these highly speculative securities, the big financial interests "got from under" the stocks and bonds they had wished on the country banks and country investors, and these securities quickly became congealed and their market price fell to unprecedented low levels.

Now, after rural banks had been reduced to impotence by this ancient and none too honorable practice, to make matters worse, the administration sought to increase the allowable credit balances of postal savings banks, so as to draw from the banks a considerable part of their remaining deposits.

But Congress balked and the administration will be forced to abandon its postal savings banks' program. Now when the banks are making a desperate effort to serve their patrons and resume their normal functions, including an extension of credit to farmers, up bobs Uncle Sam and puts on a campaign to sell baby bonds, the inevitable effect of which will be to take from the small banks and country communities a considerable part of what little cash they have left.

Secretary Mills has announced that the issue of these bonds will be "unlimited." That is to say, in marketing these securities, they will not only be offered to the so-called hoarders, but all classes of investors will have an opportunity to purchase. This really means that people who are not now hoarders, but who have misgivings as to the general banking situation, will be attracted by these Government securities, and notwithstanding the low interest rate, will be tempted to withdraw their savings or other deposits and invest the proceeds in baby bonds. Under existing economic and psychological conditions the loss of a little interest will not arrest this movement. By marketing these bonds through banks the Government seeks to bring them immediately and directly to the attention of the customers of the banks who have funds on deposit. And can you imagine the effrontery, audacity, and unmitigated gall of the Hoover-Mills crowd in asking the banks to cut their own throats by encouraging their depositors to withdraw their deposits and buy these bonds?

If the administration had deliberately planned to deplete bank deposits, injure and in many cases destroy country banks, and gobble up what little cash yet remains in rural sections, no more effective scheme could have been devised to accomplish this sinister and cynical purpose than the baby-bond plan. The net result of the Hoover-Mills plan will be to withdraw from rural communities millions of dollars that are now so badly needed to strengthen banks and serve their patrons, and concentrate these funds either in the big city banks or in the United States Treasury. This baby-bond program will absorb bank deposits that otherwise would be available for loans to farmers and other vocational groups.

Every baby bond purchased represents so much money withdrawn from local banks and sent into some distant city, where it can not possibly help the people in the community where the money was earned and where its owner lives.



Under the baby-bond plan the man who is inclined to hoard is given an opportunity, and directly encouraged and invited to withdraw his money from the bank and lend it to the United States Government. In substance the Government says to the people, "You fellows who are suspicious of banks, but lack the intestinal courage to hide your money in socks and mattresses, may now withdraw it from the banks and invest it in baby bonds, which is safer than hoarding and more patriotic." Moreover, not only hoarders but all who have money are encouraged and invited to invest in these governmental securities.

The plan will take \$10 out of the banks from moneys on deposit for every dollar it calls out of hiding. Persons who are afraid or ashamed to hoard will be encouraged to invest it in baby bonds. In a few months it will very substantially reduce bank deposits. In this critical period it puts the Government directly in competition with legitimate banking.

This latest Hoover freak formula will enable hoarders to cripple banks under the specious plea that they are performing a patriotic service by furnishing the Government money with which to meet its obligations, when in truth and fact the real purpose is to get their money out of local banks and put it in the till of Uncle Sam, in exchange for Government securities. If this money is left in the local banks it will help create a fund out of which loans can be made to farmers and other bank patrons, thereby enabling banks to resume their normal functions of extending credit as well as receiving deposits.

Reduced to its last analysis this Hoover-Mills baby-bond policy may well be defined as a plan to further deplete the deposits of country banks, and defer indefinitely the making of loans to farmers and their other customers. Seemingly, the administration is indifferent to the welfare of the small banks of the Nation. The scheme to issue baby bonds in denominations of \$50, \$100, and \$500 will reduce the circulating medium and bank deposits in thousands of rural communities. The plan will draw infinitely more money out of the banks than it will draw from places where it is now being hoarded.

There are those who are unduly suspicious and want to hoard but have not done so because they realize the risk, possible loss, or theft of their funds if withdrawn from the banks and buried or concealed in trunks, socks, clocks, and fruit jars. But now the administration comes to the aid of the hoarder and furnishes a dignified excuse for depleting bank deposits and investing the proceeds in Government securities, which, so far as the local community is concerned, has the same effect as hoarding.

The interest on these baby bonds is so low that when the mask is removed the plan is nothing more or less than a refined but absolutely safe system of hoarding. Instead of the money being concealed under the floor or buried in the ground, it is by the baby-bond system withdrawn from local banks and buried in the United States Treasury. In effect, the Government proposes to safely hoard the funds and pay a nominal interest for the privilege.

Please bear in mind that these baby bonds are not issued under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act, the Steagall-Glass bank credit liberalization act, or under any recent legislation, but are issued under the war-time second Liberty loan act of September 24, 1917 (40 Stat. 290, as amended; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 753). The securities issued by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be the obligations of that corporation and not in reality Government bonds, although the credit of the Government is behind them. The baby-bond program of the Hoover administration will neutralize and tremendously reduce the beneficial effects of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation act and the Steagall-Glass bank credit liberalization act.

It was never contemplated that the Government, in marketing its securities, would rob the rural communities of their banking capital or assets, or actively compete with legitimate banking institutions by soliciting deposits in postal-savings banks or by absorbing bank deposits through

the sale of baby bonds under the pretense that these securities are issued to call hoarded money back to the channels of trade and commerce.

I am wondering what other shortsighted and half-baked policies the Hoover administration is incubating to ravish the American banking system, milk rural communities of the little cash they have left, postpone indefinitely the extension of credit by banks to farmers, and by these and other ill-considered methods intensify the nation-wide distress under which the American people are staggering. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I rise to gain information as to the operation of the proviso so far as it may differ from the general provision at the end of the bill forbidding filling of vacancies in various cases. Wherein does this phraseology differ from the general provision as carried in the present bill?

Mr. BYRNS. As the gentleman from Wisconsin knows, this provision has been carried for many years for the purpose of holding the clerks within the grade to a salary that is the average of the grade. I do not know that there is any particular reason for carrying this language if the section relating to vacancies is to be carried in the bill, except that there may be transfers to different grades, and I can see no reason why this should not be carried, because it will hold their salaries down to the average of the grade.

Mr. STAFFORD. Until about nine years ago, as the gentleman well knows, and especially during the time that I had the special pleasure to serve with the gentleman on the subcommittee on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, we designated the number of clerks to be employed in each bureau and the number of clerks that might be authorized. During my enforced retirement from this body the Congress adopted a new method whereby the Congress votes lump-sum appropriations for the respective bureaus and the promotions are made based upon the classification act. My query is whether there has been any investigation to show whether the appropriation for clerical hire as now administered is greater under this new method of promotion by classification than under the old system, whereby we designated the respective number of individuals in each class.

Mr. BYRNS. The amount for clerical hire is undoubtedly greater. The gentleman realizes that that is due to the action of Congress in making increases. But the gentleman knows that under the old rule, to which the gentleman has referred, where specific provision was made for a certain number of increases, that the promotion was made in the sum of \$200 each. Then Congress passed a classification act, which did away with all that practice and changed the whole procedure. Personally I felt at the time that it was not going to do away with favoritism, and I do not think it did in all cases.

As the gentleman knows, we found, after the passage of the classification act, that they began to boost salaries, especially the larger ones, and if something had not been done, it would have soon developed that everybody in the grade would have been drawing the top salary.

Mr. STAFFORD. They would be in classes 1 and 2, instead of many in classes 3 and 4.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. I do not think it ought to be eliminated, even though it may not be entirely necessary, in view of the section the gentleman refers to. There may creep in transfers in various grades where this may be necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the old system, can the gentleman give us the average pay for clerks in the departments? Has the gentleman any information as to what the average pay is in the respective departments, as compared with the average pay under the old system, where the clerks were segregated by classes and designated by number?

Mr. BYRNS. The answer to the gentleman would depend largely on what he terms clerical service. The average salary of all Government employees is somewhere around \$2,100 a year.



Mr. STAFFORD. I mean the clerical services in grades 1 and 2 and 3 and 4. I understand the gentleman to say they average \$2,100, and I am certain under the old system that the average was below \$2,000.

Mr. BYRNS. I think in grade 1, \$1,800, and the lowest grade, \$1,200.

Mr. STAFFORD. And under the new method the average salary is \$2,100, whereas under the old method it was somewhere around \$1,600. So no one can deny that the Government has been very generous in providing a higher rate of pay for the respective grades.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman understands that the \$2,100 average that I have given him was in all the grades, post-office employees as well.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give me the average pay in the respective grades?

Mr. BYRNS. No; I can not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, so that I may ask one or two questions of the chairman of the committee, which will serve to give me some very necessary information. I have reference to Post Office appropriations rather than to Treasury appropriations. Perhaps in his reply to my question the gentleman can bring something of value to the new committee on economy.

I notice, first, that the one big thing which the newspapers throughout the country have dwelt upon as necessary to balance the appropriations for the Post Office Department is to abolish the franking privilege for Congress. The total amount that it cost the Post Office Department to carry congressional mail is \$530,298. I find that it costs the Post Office Department \$34,566,247 above receipts to carry the daily newspapers of the country. Also, that it costs to carry the weekly and monthly publications ten and a half million dollars more than the Government receives for that service, and for all other publications, \$26,344,744 additional. Then it costs the Post Office Department to carry the country publications eight and a half million dollars more than it receives, and that the amount which it costs the Post Office Department to carry publications exempt from zone rates is seventeen and a half million dollars more than it receives, or a total of \$96,674,617 more to carry publications that are criticizing the Congress for spending \$530,298 to answer their constituents when they write to them from Washington or when they send them information which they request. If the newspapers and magazines are going to continue to harp on that subject it might be a good idea for the Committee on Appropriations or Post Office Committee to jack up their rates so that we could balance the Post Office appropriations at least to the extent of some \$96,000,000.

We are always talking about taking the Government out of business and keeping it out of business, yet we continue to extend the business of the Post Office Department. The business of the Post Office Department is carrying the mail and the dissemination of information, but I find that on C. O. D. packages we lose \$5,321,838, that on insurance we lose over \$3,041,944, and that on money orders we lose over \$11,294,374, and on special deliveries \$166,630. If the Post Office Department is going into or is in private business, why should it not receive enough for service which is outside of its province and legitimate functions to cover the cost? Why should it not receive in insurance premiums enough to cover the cost of insurance? Why should it not receive enough to cover the cost of transportation and delivery of express and freight matter?

I call the attention of the Economy Committee to the fact that that is a pretty good place to start to save a lot of money for the Government. Now, to my question, in the consideration of this bill when these items are reached, is there any possibility of adopting an amendment which will to a certain extent equalize the tremendous burden of expense of carrying the advertising pages of newspapers and other periodicals, cover the cost of insurance, parcel post, or express and freight business, thus cutting down the ap-

propriation through the adoption of rates that will bring in somewhere near the cost of such service?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, of course that is a matter of legislation. The postal rates are fixed by law, and as the Appropriations Committee is an appropriating and not a legislating committee, it has no authority to enter into the matter of rates for any particular character of mail matter. The best thing, it seems to me, for the gentleman to do, if he desires to have an increase in these rates, is to introduce a bill and have it referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. I am sure that committee will give it attention. The gentleman knows that efforts have heretofore been made to bring about such a change without success.

Mr. UNDERHILL. If any individual Member should advocate a bill to make the newspapers and other publications pay what they really ought to pay, does the gentleman from Tennessee suppose that he would remain in Congress very long?

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from a trip West. I came to town this morning and have taken real pleasure in signing the petition to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of a resolution for a resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to the people of the country under constitutional methods.

Without any desire or intention to promote an argument for or against beer or wine or any alcoholic beverage, I say to my friends in the House that as I see the situation in the West, many thousands of people who might go along with the average prohibitionist are highly incensed at the attitude which refuses to allow the people an opportunity to express an opinion upon this question.

I think the prohibition cause, if it has any merit in it to-day, is being destroyed by the prohibitionists themselves. What the people of the country want is an opportunity to vote, through State conventions, or otherwise, and they are incensed because Members of Congress will not even grant them that privilege. I hope my friends from Illinois—and I am talking to the Illinois delegation particularly—will sign this petition to give that opportunity to the people of their State. If the general election were to-morrow, we would lose Illinois by 600,000, and Fred Britten and the other Republican candidates would be swept right off the board, through no fault of their own. Illinois is no different from many other States. It is a great Republican State and a great agricultural State. The people of Illinois want an opportunity to vote on this prohibition question, to vote on it under the Constitution as it should be voted on, and you gentlemen who are dry are hurting your cause by the position you are taking.

There is no more burning question before the American public to-day than the now dejected noble experiment on prohibition. A modification of the Volstead law is demanded from every corner of the Nation. It will benefit the farmer, the laborer, and the Federal Treasury alike. It will do more to destroy unlawful sale of alcoholic beverages than all the laws in the land put together. It will put the notorious beer baron out of business. No Member of this House can in fairness and justice refuse to sign the petition favoring a resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Distinctive paper for United States securities: For distinctive paper for United States currency, national-bank currency, and Federal reserve bank currency, not exceeding 2,000,000 pounds, including transportation of paper, traveling, mill, and other necessary expenses, and salaries of employees, and allowance, in lieu of expenses, of officer or officers detailed from the Treasury Department, not exceeding \$50 per month each when actually on duty; in all, \$770,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of such paper at a price



per pound in excess of 38 cents: *Provided further*, That in order to foster competition in the manufacture of distinctive paper for United States securities, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, to split the award for such paper for the fiscal year 1933 between the two bidders whose prices per pound are the lowest received after advertisement, but not in excess of the price fixed herein.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: On page 9, line 25, after "\$770,000," strike out the remainder of line 25 and all of lines 1 to 8, both inclusive, on page 10.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer, striking out these two provisions, is simply for the purpose of restoring the language of the existing law and the method of awarding contracts for the purchase of distinctive paper for the Government.

These are new provisions inserted in the bill, whether or not carefully worded so as to be in order I will not endeavor to say, but they bring up an interesting subject that was debated here last week and which I shall not refer to at this time. I will simply say that the language, as it will read if my amendment is adopted, is the same as that under which this contract has been awarded over a period of many years. The Government is amply protected in the amount to be paid out by the fact that the committee has seen fit to reduce by \$150,000 the aggregate of the appropriation. In the last appropriation bill the amount for this distinctive paper was \$920,000. It has been reduced to \$770,000. With that reduction, of course, I have no complaint, as I am a thorough believer in the program of economy for the Government.

In the next two paragraphs, where the committee arbitrarily limits the price per pound to be paid for this paper, I must say that we are taking chances of not getting any distinctive paper for the purpose of printing our money. Certainly we all want a little of that available. There is no evidence whatsoever submitted to the committee that it can secure this whole contract for 38 cents per pound. I have looked through the hearings carefully, and while one bidder, a year or two ago, offered to take a portion of this contract at 38½ cents a pound, there is nothing to show that the committee at any point secured evidence that the Treasury Department could obtain the entire 1,200 tons required of distinctive paper at a price of 38 cents. Therefore the department may find itself in the position where, after the bids are opened, no bidder will furnish the paper at 38 cents a pound. Then where will the department be? They will be faced with the clause prohibiting the Government paying more than 38 cents a pound, and still the Government can not get the paper at that price.

The second proviso which I have asked to have stricken out contains this language: "That in order to foster competition in the manufacture of distinctive paper for United States securities." There positively is competition to-day, Mr. Chairman. Anyone who wants to go to the expense of setting up an enormous plant, sufficiently equipped with special machinery and other facilities to be able to supply the Federal Government with 1,200 tons of this distinctive paper, has the privilege of submitting a bid. The Government never has said that only one bidder may bid on this paper. A half dozen bidders have tried it at various times. One year the Comptroller General authorized a small portion of the contract to be let to a separate bidder. All well and good. That can still be done. I personally would be willing to see inserted here language that would actually authorize that sort of thing, but when the language reads "in order to foster competition," which already exists, it implies there is no competition. The fact that only one concern is competent to supply the quantity required does not prove the existence of a monopoly. The market is wide open to competition. There are hundreds of paper makers scattered throughout the country. They

are not confined to New England. In New York, Wisconsin, and the West there are many paper mills. They know exactly what is required to produce this distinctive paper. If they see fit to spend several million dollars to equip a plant, they can do so. There is no secret about making this paper. At one time it was controlled by a patent, but that patent has long since expired, and the market is wide open.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. So that if the paper manufacturers of the country desire to compete for this contract, they have that opportunity and have had it right along.

In addition to that, various paper manufacturers have stated that the price at which this contract has been let in years past was not exorbitant, and that in no sense was there any effort to gouge the Government. Nevertheless, some people now impute such an effort to the present contractor. It is purely a business proposition. This country sees fit to encourage big business. We ought to have the best quality of product conceivable, and yet, all at once, in order to satisfy a grudge against a paper concern, certain persons attack that concern. There was an effort to establish a Government mill for the production of distinctive paper here in the District of Columbia, which was fought and defeated, and this is another effort to nurse that same grudge.

All I ask is fair consideration of the method under which this contract has been let for years past. Why is there any occasion to change that policy? By adopting the amendment which I have offered we simply continue the present system of letting this contract.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, for a great many years, as the Members of the House know, the Government has been wholly at the mercy of a monopoly when it comes to providing distinctive paper. The Crane Co. for years and years, located in the district represented by my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], has had a monopoly in the supplying of this paper. There have been no other companies manufacturing this particular kind of paper, which is peculiar in its texture, of course, and different from that which is provided in ordinary commercial use, which have been in a position to take care of their regular trade and at the same time to supply the full amount needed by the Government. In a case of that kind the committee felt it was necessary, in order to protect the Government, that some limitation should be thrown around the amount which the Government was required to pay. Under the law the Government must go through a more or less foolish process in this particular instance of asking for bids and making advertisements.

In the end there is only one bid, and, of course, there is nothing to do but to accept that bid.

A year ago the Government, in its effort to see if something could not be done to get a little cheaper paper, called for bids based upon the total amount, which was 1,420 tons, if I remember correctly, with the proviso that bids would be accepted for 400 tons or less. There were just two bidders, the Crane Co. and the Collins Manufacturing Co., also of Massachusetts. The Collins Manufacturing Co. submitted a bid for 400 tons at 38½ cents per pound. The Crane Co. submitted a conditional bid. It said:

If we get all of the contract, we will furnish this paper for 43 cents a pound, but if we do not get it all the rate will be 48 cents per pound; in other words, we will bid for the remainder of the paper at 48 cents per pound.

The bids were received and submitted to the Comptroller General, and he very properly, I think, decided that the Crane Co.'s bid should be accepted, because it meant a saving of money to the United States to accept all of it at



43 cents a pound rather than to accept 400 tons at 38½ cents a pound and 1,020 tons at 48 cents a pound. So the Government is paying to-day 43 cents a pound for distinctive paper.

The estimates were based upon 42 cents a pound, it being thought by the department that on account of falling prices there would be a reduction in the cost of paper, but your committee felt that was not a sufficient decrease. Here was a company, mind you, that offered a bid of 38½ cents per pound for 400 tons, and your committee felt that in view of the attitude of the Treasury Department to the effect that the cost of paper should be at least 1 cent less in 1933 than it was in 1932 it was entirely justified in fixing not exceeding 38 cents a pound as a reasonable price for the sale of this paper.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Would the gentleman be kind enough to tell us where, in his knowledge, a fixed price has been set rather than an aggregate sum in the appropriation?

Mr. BYRNS. I have no knowledge of any fixed price, but I will say this to the gentleman: If we made this appropriation without fixing the price, there would be no limitation on the company and it could bid any amount it pleased, and being the only company its bid would have to be accepted.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have not figured it out, but may I ask the gentleman what figure was used in reaching the estimate of \$770,000?

Mr. BYRNS. Thirty-eight cents a pound.

Mr. TREADWAY. So you are fixing the amount at 38 cents a pound in your appropriation?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. If we were to limit this to \$770,000 and not fix an upset price of 38 cents a pound, the gentleman can well see that this sole bidder could come in and bid 40 cents a pound. That company would get the contract and it would have the right to furnish paper to the extent of this \$770,000, at 40 cents a pound. We have fixed it at not exceeding 38 cents a pound, and \$770,000 will take care of the whole situation if the bid is made upon that basis.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts to ask whether there was any comparable case where the Government fixed the price of articles which it purchased. I know the gentleman from Tennessee will recall that the price was fixed in the case of the purchase of typewriters. The price of the typewriters was more or less controlled by a trust, and the committee fixed a flat price at which typewriters should be purchased, which resulted in a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Treasury of the United States. This is an instance that is comparable to that, because this one company virtually has the Government by the neck.

Mr. BYRNS. And I am reminded, I will say to my friend—and I thank him for calling my attention to the case of the typewriters—that the price of smokeless powder was fixed several years ago by Congress because it was a monopoly. Because of that action the price was brought down from 65 cents to something a little over 50 cents.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that action was taken at the instance of the then chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Sherley, who was interested in that subject.

Mr. BYRNS. I believe so.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not a fact, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has intimated, that there was more or less collusion in the case of the manufacturer and the sale of typewriters? The debate on the floor showed that there was an

agreement and collusion among the typewriter concerns to stick the Government, but here you have a wide-open market and there is no question of any agreement being reached between the paper manufacturers.

Mr. BYRNS. I would not want to charge there was collusion, yet there was some indication of it; but I will say to the gentleman that is no worse than having one man who has the Government at his mercy and can charge any price he pleases. So I think this is peculiarly a case where the Government, in protection of itself, ought to fix the price.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it is a case where the Government can more easily be held up.

Mr. BYRNS. I think so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Collecting the revenue from customs: For collecting the revenue from customs, for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, and not to exceed \$10,000 for the securing of evidence of violations of the customs laws, including expenses of transportation and transfer of customs receipts from points where there are no Government depositories, not to exceed \$79,200 for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 5, sec. 118a), not to exceed \$1,700 for any one person, not to exceed \$5,000 for the hire of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, and not to exceed \$500 for subscriptions to newspapers, \$22,700,000, of which such amount as may be necessary shall be available for the cost of seizure, storage, and disposition of any merchandise, vehicle and team, automobile, boat, air or water craft, or any other conveyance seized under the provisions of the customs laws, when the proceeds of sale are insufficient therefor or where there is no sale, and \$494,470 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia exclusive of 10 persons from the field force authorized to be detailed under section 525 of the tariff act of 1930: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance or repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for use in the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, line 2, strike out the word "and," and on the same page, in line 3, after the word "newspapers," insert the following: "and including the purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor cycles."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I may state to the committee that the Bureau of Customs has had three automobiles at its disposal here in the District of Columbia. This bill takes these three automobiles from the bureau. They need the motor cycles for their messengers, and all the amendment is intended to accomplish is to give them a couple of motor cycles instead of the automobiles we have taken from them. I will then offer another amendment which will restore one of these automobiles for the use of the customhouse in the District of Columbia, which is really a field position.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The one here in the District of Columbia is local?

Mr. BYRNS. It is local, but the machine is used at the District office over in Georgetown.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. How about the whole of Puget Sound, where there are many cities, all with a head office at Seattle, for instance, called the district of Puget Sound?

Mr. BYRNS. This does not affect Puget Sound.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It does in principle, because it is local.

Mr. BYRNS. This is not local in that sense, I may say to the gentleman. This is for the customhouse over in Georgetown. It is necessary for him to come over here to the bureau every day, and it is also necessary for the examiners here in the District to go around and make various examinations. Having taken three automobiles from him, we felt it was perfectly fair to leave him one for official use only.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is a gain of 1—taking 2 and giving 1.

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.



The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS: On page 11, in line 15, after the word "Columbia," insert the following: "except one for use in connection with the work of the customhouse in Georgetown."

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment to which I referred a moment ago.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The offices of comptrollers of customs, surveyors of customs, and appraisers of merchandise (except the appraiser of merchandise at the port of New York), 29 in all, with annual salaries aggregating \$153,800, are hereby abolished. The duties imposed by law and regulation upon comptrollers, surveyors, and appraisers of customs, their assistants and deputies (except the appraiser, his assistants and deputies at the port of New York), are hereby transferred to, imposed upon, and continued in positions, now established in the Customs Service by or pursuant to law, as the Secretary of the Treasury by appropriate regulation shall specify; and he is further authorized to designate the titles by which such positions shall be officially known hereafter. The Secretary of the Treasury, in performing the duties imposed upon him by this paragraph, shall administer the same in such a manner that the transfer of duties provided hereby will not result in the establishment of any new positions in the Customs Service.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the section, beginning in line 16, page 11, and running through line 8, on page 12, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the lady desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. KAHN. No; I think it is self-evident. I do not think it needs any argument.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, the committee acknowledges that the provision to which the point of order has been made, abolishing these offices of appraisers, comptrollers, and surveyors of customs, is legislation on an appropriation bill and changes existing law.

Under the provisions of clause 2 of Rule XXI, known as the Holman rule, legislation is in order upon an appropriation bill if it conforms to that rule.

The pertinent portion of clause 2 of that rule is as follows:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill \* \* \*.

The committee contends that the paragraph in this bill to which objection has been raised is in order under the provisions of the Holman rule.

Under previous decisions legislation to be in order under this rule must be germane to the bill and must retrench expenditures in one of the three methods set forth in the rule, namely, (1) by reduction of the number and salary of officers of the United States, (2) by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or (3) by the reduction of the amounts of money covered by the bill.

Under previous decisions of the House it has also been held that it is not enough merely to reduce the number and compensation of officers of the United States or the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury, but the legislation must retrench expenditures in doing that. On this point Chairman Saunders, in a decision on December 9, 1922, said:

The many rulings on this question are fairly uniform. They all hold that when, on the face of the bill, the proposed new legislation retrenches expenditures in one of three ways the point of order should be overruled, and the rule is generally laid down that the construction should be liberal in favor of retrenchment of governmental expenditures.

Under previous decisions it has also been held that the retrenchment in expenditures must not be conjectural or speculative but must show on the face of the legislation. In this connection Speaker Kerr held:

In considering the question whether an amendment operates to retrench expenditures, the Chair can only look to what is properly of record before him—that is, the pending bill, the specific section under consideration, the law of the land, so far as it is applicable, and the parliamentary rules and practice of the House; and beyond these he is not permitted to go in deciding the question.

In discussing the question of the saving, Chairman Saunders also said:

The Chair can only act upon the proposition which is presented on the face of that proposition.

In presenting this paragraph under the Holman rule the committee believes that it answers all of the requirements laid down under sound decisions:

(1) It is germane; (2) it reduces the number and salary of officers of the United States; (3) it retrenches expenditures; (4) the retrenchment is not speculative or argumentative but is specific; (5) every part of the legislation is essential.

1. Germaneness: The bill makes appropriations for the Customs Service, and customarily carries salaries for the offices proposed to be abolished.

2. Reduction of offices and salaries: The paragraph provides for the abolition of 29 offices established by law and now in existence, with salaries aggregating annually \$153,800. Under the provisions of the paragraph these offices are eliminated commencing with the date of approval of this bill. The incumbents in them will at that time be removed from the pay roll.

3. Retrenchment of expenditures: The paragraph retrenches expenditures by the elimination of these offices and the saving of the salaries. That is complete on the face of the legislation.

4. The retrenchment is not speculative: The definiteness of the saving can not be controverted. The bill abolishes the 29 positions. They will be gone. The duties are transferred specifically to other positions in the service. The work will be continued. No added expense will come from this transfer, because the paragraph provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall make the transfer and carry out the legislation without adding any new positions. The retrenchment is specific, definite, and complete. There is no escape from saving \$153,800, and in making up this bill the committee has taken out that amount.

5. Every part of the legislation proposed is necessary to the reduction: The legislation is divided into the following parts:

(a) Abolition of the positions; (b) transfer of the duties to positions now in the service; (c) change in title of existing positions after the transfer to make the title accord to the new duties transferred to them; (d) require the Secretary to administer the transfer of duties in such a way as not to establish any new position.

The necessity of all portions of the legislation and its intimate relationship to the effectiveness and conclusiveness of the retrenchment must be apparent. Without all of the parts the legislation would not be effective.

The CHAIRMAN. I am afraid the Chair is not in harmony with the position of the lady from California. It would seem to the Chair that this paragraph is safely enfolded in the embrace of the Holman Rule. For the benefit of the lady from California the Chair will say that to be in order under the Holman rule three things must concur—first, it must be germane; second, it must retrench expenditures; and, third, the language embodied in the paragraph must be confined solely to the purpose of retrenching expenditures.

The Chair finds upon examination of the paragraph that it is germane to the portion of the bill wherein it is inserted. The paragraph on its face definitely reduces the number of officers of the United States by 29 and thereby saves \$153,800, thus retrenching expenditures.



The remaining question for the Chair to determine is whether there is any language in the paragraph that is legislation which does not contribute to the retrenchment of the \$153,800.

The Chair has examined the paragraph with considerable care in order to determine whether the legislation is coupled up with and essential to the reduction of money. The Chair finds that the paragraph abolishes a number of positions, that it transfers the duties heretofore performed by the officers holding those positions to positions now in the service, that in order to accomplish that it confers upon the Secretary of the Treasury authority to designate the titles of the employees now in the service who are to perform the additional duties, that it requires the Secretary to administer the transfer of duties in such a way as not to establish any new positions. It is apparent to the Chair that all the legislation to be found in the paragraph is necessary to accomplish the purpose of retrenching expenditures. The Chair thinks that the paragraph clearly comes within the provisions of the Holman rule and overrules the point of order.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DYER: On page 11, line 17, after the word "appraiser," add the letter "s," and in line 18, after the words "New York," add the words "and the port of St. Louis, Mo.," and in line 23, after the words "New York," add "and the port of St. Louis, Mo."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee, in this bill, by this provision, if agreed to by the committee and the House, is undoing something that has been in existence in this country for many, many years. The appraisers of merchandise have been very essential and very beneficial.

I wish to refer a moment to a quotation from a statement by Captain Eble, Commissioner of Customs, made at Portland, Oreg., in July of last year, in which he said:

The most important work incidental to collecting the customs revenue is performed at the appraiser's stores.

Mr. Chairman, the appraiser's office is revenue-producing; and when we take into consideration the vast amount of revenue to the Government through the workings of this office, the incidental expense of the appraiser is negligible.

They are attempting by this bill to do away with the salary of the appraiser at St. Louis, amounting to \$4,600. This is the only item that would be saved, as to St. Louis, if you agreed to the bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Let me give you some figures in regard to the collections of this office to see whether or not its elimination is justified.

The duties collected in St. Louis in 1927 were \$2,917,000; in 1928, \$2,870,000; in 1929, \$3,230,000; in 1930, \$3,039,300.

During 1931 there was collected at this port \$2,094,319, and this was in a year when business was very poor all over the country. The appraiser's office was created more than 100 years ago, and it was evidently well thought out and very carefully considered.

The appraiser's office may be said to be similar to that of assessor which appraises property upon which taxes are collected by the collector, and for the same reason that the appraiser and collector should not be the same person, but one should be a check against the other.

If the office of the appraiser were consolidated with that of the collector, one can readily see there would be no such check; and it seems to us that such an arrangement would operate to the detriment of the Government, and we would find an opportunity open, perhaps, to colossal graft.

There seems to be no doubt but that the appraiser's office was meant as a safeguard, and surely it would be unwise and false economy to abolish this or any other department which safeguards the Public Treasury. And let us constantly keep in mind the fact that the office of the appraiser of merchandise is one of the revenue-producing units of our Government, and because of this fact it is my opinion that it should not be disturbed.

I have here a statement from Hon. Edmond Koeln, the collector of internal revenue for the city of St. Louis, in which he calls attention to the fact that some years ago the city of St. Louis, in adopting a new charter, provided that the appraiser and collector for water rates be the same person. Prior to that time they had been different persons. He says that it was but a few months after this took place that it was found in checking back the water department that there were discrepancies amounting to \$140,000 a year or more. It seems that they got in a rut and it was practically all up to one man and one organization to handle both jobs, and they found after checking back the records, after they were taken over by the water commissioner and collector of revenue, that many water taps and meters in the city appeared on the records as being shut off for nonpayment and other reasons, which, in fact, were still on and water being supplied to the premises without any charge by the department. This was corrected only after the water commissioner simply assessed all water rates due and then turned over the bills for collection to the collector of revenue.

If we do not adopt this amendment, there will be no check on the work of the appraiser and the collector of customs at St. Louis. The bill provides that the employees, which are few in number, in the appraiser's office shall be transferred to the collector's office. The total expense of the appraiser's office in St. Louis does not amount to exceed \$30,140, and they average two and a half million dollars collections annually for the Federal Government.

My amendment would not change the situation, except it would except the appraiser of St. Louis, who receives a salary of \$4,600. That is all this would cost the Federal Government if it were agreed to. Is not that true, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes; but may I interrupt the gentleman? The gentleman is speaking only of St. Louis. They have collected \$1,594,320 customs. But let me call the gentleman's attention to offices where they have collected four or five million dollars, which have no appraiser and no surveyor.

Mr. DYER. Yes; those are places where they do not need an appraiser of merchandise.

Mr. BYRNS. But they collect four or five times as much money.

Mr. DYER. But I think on this one proposition the committee has gone too far. Of course, I take it that it is done under the guise of economy; but it surely is not economy, Mr. Chairman, to take this step and the danger in transferring these two positions in the Government into one, where there have been two officers for more than a hundred years, and it is bad legislation to place all this important work in the hands of one man.

The danger of mistakes, the danger of falsification, are very apparent to those who consider the situation as it would be under the proposed change. With a check provided between the two offices, at a very small expense, there is no danger of loss of money to the Government. I think it is mighty poor economy and that we ought not to permit it. It is going to the extent almost of the Appropriations Committee legislating people out of office. The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. KAHN] made the point of order, which unfortunately could not be sustained by the chairman because it comes under the Holman rule. It is going mighty far, however, when the Committee on Appropriations brings in legislation here putting people out of office and reducing the salaries of those who are in office. That is pretty close to legislating, and I think we ought not to permit it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the action of the committee in abolishing the office of appraiser in St. Louis, but I do not propose to approach the question in the manner in which, at least in part, my colleague did. We have in the St. Louis appraiser's office probably a dozen or more men. I think the chief examiner has been in the St. Louis office for over 30 years. I can not bring myself to believe, even if this office is abolished, that there is any danger of anyone robbing the Government, and I do not feel the present appraiser would think so; in fact I am sure she would not. Men of the highest type are



employed in this office, and they will be a check upon the collector if you abolish this office.

The question involved here is whether or not this office should be abolished. The lady in charge of the office in St. Louis is a personal friend of mine. She has proved to be an excellent appraiser. She is always on the job. Naturally, I dislike to see her lose her position.

We collected in St. Louis last year \$1,549,320. I think if gentlemen on the other side had not passed the Smoot-Hawley tariff law, we would have collected a great deal more.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. Does the gentleman agree that the committee has shown no favors in this matter—that they have just arbitrarily eliminated these offices all over the country, with one exception.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I fully agree, and I brought that out when the chairman was making his statement on Saturday.

Mr. MEAD. The appraiser in my city is also abolished. Does the gentleman believe there are enough of us representing these cities to form a bloc to obstruct the progress of this wave of economy which so righteously comes upon us?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I do not. I can see it coming now, and the committee will stand by the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations, as it has in every instance this year; all amendments offered are defeated. We will be smothered with noes in a few minutes when the question is put. Mr. Chairman, we are facing a situation that requires us to do a great many things now that we would not do if conditions were otherwise. I am sorry to see anyone lose their position, especially a personal friend, but how are you going to spend money when there is no money to be spent? The Internal Revenue Commissioner is receiving daily reports from collectors all over the United States. They are taking the income-tax returns for 1931 and comparing them with the income-tax returns for 1930, and they are able to see what is going to happen. We have a deficit to face, and it is getting larger all the time. I must admit that the Committee on Appropriations has not treated my city unfairly, as it has done the same to all cities in the country having such an office, with the exception of New York, and with good grace, I am compelled to take the medicine. [Applause.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations, of which I have the honor to be a member, proposes to lessen the burden of taxation by abolishing a number of high-salaried offices that are as useless in the public service as the fifth wheel is to a wagon or the appendix is to the human anatomy.

Among these are 29 presidential offices in the Customs Service, 15 appraisers of customs, 7 comptrollers of customs, and 7 surveyors of customs.

The least salaried of all of these officials draws \$3,200 a year from the Public Treasury and the highest salaried \$9,000 a year.

It was brought out in our subcommittee that by wiping these 29 useless officials off of the pay rolls we are able to make a sheer saving of \$153,800 a year, and that is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I would rather not at this moment.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman is making the statement that these offices are useless. I would like him to tell the committee where he got the information that the appraiser at St. Louis is useless.

Mr. LUDLOW. The information came from official sources.

Mr. DYER. What official? Name him.

Mr. LUDLOW. The total receipts of the Portland (Me.) customs office are now about \$160,000 a year, according to the Bureau of Customs. Therefore, practically the equivalent of the entire income of that port is required to pay the very comfortable salaries of these 29 useless officials. That

money ought to go into the Treasury of the United States instead of into the pockets of officials who do not earn it.

The offices in the Customs Service it is proposed to abolish and the salaries attached thereto are as follows:

Appraisers of customs: Philadelphia, Pa., \$5,600; Boston, Mass., \$6,000; San Francisco, Calif., \$5,600; New Orleans, La., \$5,200; Baltimore, Md., \$5,000; Chicago, Ill., \$6,000; Buffalo, N. Y., \$4,600; Detroit, Mich., \$4,600; Tampa, Fla., \$3,800; Cleveland, Ohio, \$4,600; Cincinnati, Ohio, \$3,800; St. Louis, Mo., \$4,600; Portland, Me., \$3,800; Pittsburgh, Pa., \$4,600; Portland, Oreg., \$4,400; total, \$72,200.

Comptrollers of customs: New York, N. Y., \$9,000; Philadelphia, Pa., \$5,800; Boston, Mass., \$5,600; San Francisco, Calif., \$5,600; New Orleans, La., \$5,600; Baltimore, Md., \$5,600; Chicago, Ill., \$5,600; total, \$42,800.

Surveyors of customs: New York, N. Y., \$9,000; Philadelphia, Pa., \$5,600; Boston, Mass., \$5,800; San Francisco, Calif., \$5,600; New Orleans, La., \$4,600; Baltimore, Md., \$5,000; total, \$38,800.

It is no reflection on the very respectable and esteemed persons who occupy these offices to say that they do nothing to earn their salaries. That is not their fault. There is nothing for them to do. The work is so organized that they are absolute excess. If all 29 of them were to go to Europe and watch the whirling wheels at Monte Carlo, bask under the sunny skies of Italy, or cruise up and down the Mediterranean, the work would go on smoothly, methodically, and efficiently without a split second's difference.

Take, for instance, the appraisers of customs, who compose the most numerous class slated for abolishment. There are 15 of these superfluous officials, whose salaries are an annual charge of \$72,200 on the taxpayers. There are 300 ports of entry. At 285 of these there is an acting appraiser, who is the real head and director of the appraisal force. At 15 ports where there is an appraiser there is a chief assistant appraiser, who directs the force. If this legislation passes and the appraisers are abolished the chief assistant appraiser will be called hereafter the acting appraiser and the work will go on exactly as it always has gone on. Enactment of this legislation will leave only one appraiser of customs in the service—the appraiser at New York City. Approximately 60 per cent of the entire customs revenue is collected at the port of New York, where the appraisal force consists of about 1,000 employees. The appropriations committee was advised by the Customs Bureau that in that instance it would be advisable to continue the appraiser on account of the peculiar circumstances surrounding the New York office.

There are seven comptrollers of customs, all as useless as a last year's bird's nest. The function of the comptroller's office is really that of an auditor. There are 48 customs districts, which are divided for auditing purposes into 7 groups under 7 comptrollers.

Auditing customs accounts is a highly specialized business, and the active man at the head is the deputy comptroller, who has been brought up in the auditing business and knows it from A to Z. He guides the work and is the authority on all points of administration, while the comptroller draws the big salary. On account of the technical and specialized nature of the work it is easy to realize how big a misfit in the comptroller's job is a politician who is picked up off of the street and appointed comptroller without any knowledge of the technicalities of auditing. It is a joke; a rather costly one, but a joke. Under the reorganization that will follow this legislation the name of the deputy comptrollers probably will be changed to auditors of customs and the work will go on just as usual, while the taxpayers will be relieved to the extent of \$42,800 by the abolishment of the comptrollerships.

We now come to the surveyors of customs. There is another indefensible charge on the Treasury to the extent of \$38,800 per annum in salaries paid to seven surveyors who are just as useful to the public service as the man in the moon. At every port where there is a surveyor there is an assistant surveyor who performs all of the duties of the



head of the office. He is a civil service appointee who is trained in the work. If this legislation passes and surveyors of customs go to join the dinosaur and other creatures of a forgotten age the title of deputy surveyors will be changed to deputy collectors and the work will proceed as usual.

The utter ridiculousness of maintaining these useless and expensive offices in the Customs Service is well known to everybody in that service. Detroit is a great port of entry and there is no surveyor of customs at Detroit although the volume of business there is fifteen or twenty times as great as other places where there is a surveyor. At Portland, Me., where, as I have said, customs receipts are running about \$160,000 per annum, there are three presidential officials, all drawing sizable salaries, collector, appraiser, and comptroller. Again I say it is a joke—a costly joke.

Why is it necessary to have three presidential appointees at a small port like Portland, Me., where such a limited amount of customs revenue is collected, while at Galveston, Tex., where we collect close to \$6,000,000 a year, there is no surveyor and no appraiser and only one presidential appointee, the official in charge?

The same question applies to Los Angeles, where \$5,000,000 is collected annually in customs revenue and where there is but one presidential appointee, the collector.

I might state that there is but one customs official in charge at Winston-Salem, N. C., Savannah, Ga., Seattle, Wash., Norfolk, Va., Nogales, Ariz., Reidsville, N. C., Providence, R. I., Honolulu, Hawaii, Rochester, N. Y., and Houston, Tex., where customs collections run from one to five million dollars at each port. Now, it seems to me if no surveyor or appraiser is necessary at these latter ports, where customs collections run from ten to thirty times as much as those collected at Portland, Me., that the offices of surveyor and appraiser at Portland are absolutely unnecessary and involve a waste of public money. The same applies to these superfluous officials who, I see from the record, are stationed at Pittsburgh, Pa., Buffalo, N. Y., Tampa, Fla., Detroit, Mich., St. Louis, Mo., Cleveland, Ohio, Cincinnati, Ohio, and Portland, Ore.

The abolishment of these useless offices would tend to administrative efficiency, for the presence at any port of two or more officials, all of the presidential grade and jealous of their dignity, is bound to create friction. Therefore, while the appraisers, comptrollers, and surveyors are useless, they are a little worse than useless, for they create inharmonious in the service.

If anyone were to propose, with the general distress that now prevails and in the temper of these times, to create these sinecures, he would get nowhere, and would bring upon himself a rebuke from the entire country. Let us do a real service to the country by abolishing these sinecures.

Neither is there any reason in sound administration why the assay offices at Carson City, Nev., Salt Lake City, Utah, Boise, Idaho, and Helena, Mont., should not be abolished, and there is every reason why they should be abolished.

Four distinct savings would be effected, as follows:

First. In salaries to personnel.

Second. In releasing for other Federal activities Government buildings that are now occupied by assay offices.

Third. In the cost of maintaining metallurgical laboratories and purchase of such supplies as crucibles, acids, fluxes, and fuels required to operate these assay offices separately.

Fourth. In savings on express charges on gold bullion.

The entire saving would considerably exceed \$25,000 a year on personnel and supplies alone, to say nothing of the saving to be effected by releasing Federal buildings to other Government activities that now occupy leased quarters.

The Government owns the assay buildings at Carson City, Boise, and Helena. The Salt Lake City assay office occupies two rooms in a Government-owned building.

The chief function of the assay offices is to make assays of gold bullion sent in for purchase by the Government.

After the bullion is assayed it becomes the Government's property and is forwarded by express at Government cost to the mint at San Francisco or Denver.

By abolishing the assay offices the Government would save the express charges it now has to pay on bullion from the assay office to the mint. Under the new order the bullion would be assayed at the mint and would be shipped to the mint at the seller's cost.

Assaying ore for prospectors is a very minor part of the duties of the assay offices and no great hardship or hindrance would be imposed on prospectors if the assay offices were abolished, in which event they would send their samples by parcel post to Seattle to be assayed. In modern times the use of the assay offices for this purpose has been confined to small prospectors who usually send in a handful or two of ore to be assayed, and the Bureau of the Mint advises that not over 5 per cent of these samples show any producing value.

The assay offices are ancient institutions which once were helpful in developing mining of precious metals in the West but which long since outlived their usefulness. The Carson City assay office was established March 3, 1863; the Boise assay office February 19, 1869; the Helena assay office May 12, 1874, and the Salt Lake City assay office May 30, 1908. All are obsolete relics of the past, and in carrying out the economy program they should be abolished.

For further enlightenment I will read the following letter from R. J. Grant, Director of the Mint:

FEBRUARY 25, 1932.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In response to your letter of February 20, I am giving below a statement covering the number of bullion and ore assays made by the assay offices at Carson City, Salt Lake City, Boise, and Helena during the fiscal year 1931:

Institution	On bullion deposited for purchase by the Government	On samples of bullion and ore sent in
Carson City.....	1,111	162
Salt Lake City.....	400	240
Boise.....	1,177	667
Helena.....	976	41

If the facilities of the four assay offices named above were not at the disposal of the public, assays of ores and bullion could be made at the mint in New Orleans or at the assay office in Seattle. Deposits of gold forwarded for purchase could be shipped to San Francisco or to Denver.

Very truly yours,

R. J. GRANT.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment. There are 29 of these offices that we propose to abolish in this bill, the aggregate pay of which is \$153,000 a year. The committee was convinced beyond any question of doubt that there is about as much use for these offices, that we propose to abolish, as there is a cat having nine tails. They are purely political sinecures and have been for a hundred years. They were created in the first place as political sinecures, and they have maintained their individuality in that respect ever since. One of these some years ago was appointed at Chicago. At that time he was called the naval port officer. That did not seem to jibe very well with the rest of the offices, so they changed the name to comptroller, and he is still occupying that position and drawing his pay as such. It was suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] that the appraisal of these foreign, imported goods, is a very important function. That is true. Everything depends on a fair appraisal, but these appraisers do not do the appraising. That is done by the collector and under his supervision.

The same with reference to the comptroller. He does not control anything but his salary. All he does is draw his pay.

Then it was suggested there should be a check upon some of these other officers. The check is furnished by the auditors. No one is proposing to do away with the auditing of these accounts, and, in consequence, there is no danger in that respect.

So, as I have stated, it is the same character of office that the subtreasurers were. We tried a long time before we



succeeded in doing away with the subtreasurers, and after the adoption of the Federal reserve act there was absolutely no occasion for those officers. They then became purely sinecures, but they have gone, and nobody now contends for a moment that disposing of them has hurt the Treasury Department in any degree whatever. I remember very well when in every State in the Union, especially throughout the North, there were pension commissioners. I dare say there are few of you here to-day who remember what their duties were. They were pure political sinecures. It took years and years for this Congress to do away with them. These offices are in the same category. There is no one who has any excuse whatever for supporting this amendment except those who have these offices in their respective communities.

Mr. DYER. I can not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. If we felt for a moment that it would be a detriment in the least degree to the operations of the Government, none of us would be in favor of their abolishment.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. DYER. If the gentleman is so sure that nobody can object to this except those who have these offices in their districts, I would like to ask the gentleman why, for a hundred years, most of which time the gentleman himself has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, he has not brought this in before?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Well, it is somewhat like cutting off the pup's tail. We have to do it a little at a time so that it will not hurt so much. We have been trying for a long time to abolish some of these assay offices. We are going to try to do that again in this bill. We have succeeded in doing it time and time again in this House, but the gentlemen over at the other end of the Capitol, for some reason or other, think the whole fabric would fall to pieces if they did not retain them, and we will have that same trouble again. But when we are trying to economize, the best place to economize is where there is absolutely no excuse for the original expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Collecting the internal revenue: For expenses of assessing and collecting the internal revenue taxes, including the employment of a Commissioner of Internal Revenue at \$10,000 per annum, a general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue at \$10,000 per annum, an assistant to the commissioner, a special deputy commissioner, three deputy commissioners, one stamp agent (to be reimbursed by the stamp manufacturers), and the necessary officers, collectors, deputy collectors, attorneys, experts, agents, accountants, inspectors, clerks, janitors, and messengers in the District of Columbia, the several collection districts, and the several divisions of internal-revenue agents, to be appointed as provided by law, telegraph and telephone service, rental of quarters outside the District of Columbia, postage, freight, express, necessary expenses incurred in making investigations in connection with the enrollment or disbarment of practitioners before the Treasury Department in internal-revenue matters, expenses of seizure and sale, and other necessary miscellaneous expenses, including stenographic reporting services, and the purchase of such supplies, equipment, furniture, mechanical devices, law books and books of reference, and such other articles as may be necessary for use in the District of Columbia, the several collection districts, and the several divisions of internal-revenue agents, \$33,650,000, of which amount not to exceed \$9,122,560 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of this amount shall be used in defraying the expenses of any officer designated above, subpoenaed by the United States court to attend any trial before a United States court or preliminary examination before any United States commissioner, which expenses shall be paid from the appropriation for "Fees of witnesses, United States courts": *Provided further*, That not more than \$100,000 of the total amount appropriated herein may be expended by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for detecting and bringing to trial persons guilty of violating the internal revenue laws or conniving at the same, including payments for information and detection of such violation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

My purpose is to ascertain from the chairman of the committee whether the appropriation for the enforcement of the internal revenue acts has become static or whether there will be opportunity for the appropriation to be curtailed as the years go by. Some years ago they were back several years in the examination of the income-tax returns. Can the gentleman give any information as to the current condition of their work and whether this appropriation of \$33,650,000 is likely to be the permanent appropriation, as long as we have the income-tax and corporation-tax provisions in the law?

Mr. BYRNS. No. Not necessarily. They are very nearly current in their work. The gentleman will note that the committee cut the appropriation in the sum of only \$110,000. The committee did not seek to make any greater cut in the appropriation for the reason that it recognized that a new tax bill or a new revenue bill would be passed soon, and, of course, that will entail additional duties upon this particular office. For that reason the committee made no greater cut than it did.

Mr. STAFFORD. Were it not for the prospect of additional work being thrown upon the bureau by reason of the proposed income-tax measure, the gentleman's committee would have felt warranted in cutting this appropriation?

Mr. BYRNS. I think it possibly could have been cut to a considerable extent, but we did not cut it, for the reason stated.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation of civilian employees in the field, including clerks to district commanders, \$105,220.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee if this reduction of \$105,220 contains any reduction in wages?

Mr. BYRNS. No; none at all. There are the same number and at the same salary.

Mr. GOSS. Is there any reduction of wages anywhere through this bill?

Mr. BYRNS. No; except the provision that will be carried at the end of the bill. That does not reduce any wages, but it prevents increases in salaries.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, Coast Guard, exclusive of commandant's office, \$28,510,220.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to ask the chairman of the committee with reference to the Coast Guard School. I have had many requests from boys in my district who can not get into Annapolis or West Point, who are very anxious to know about the Coast Guard School. I know they have literature, but I would be glad if the gentleman from Tennessee would take a little time and give us, for the benefit of the Record, in order that the public may read it, something about what the Coast Guard is accomplishing in the school.

Mr. BYRNS. I will say to the gentleman that there has recently been established this school to which the gentleman refers, at New London, Conn. It is fashioned along the same lines as the West Point Military Academy and the Naval Academy at Annapolis. Its curriculum is about the same.

The appointments are made through competitive examinations. Applications are made to the Commandant of the Coast Guard, and he holds these competitive examinations. When this new academy is completed, which will be in the fall, it will have a capacity of about 200 students.

Mr. GLOVER. As I understand, the students graduate with the same degree as those who graduate at the other institutions?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes. The graduates are given commissions in the Coast Guard Service, and in war time they are covered into the Naval Service.

Mr. HASTINGS. Is any preference given to the States?

Mr. BYRNS. No.



Mr. HASTINGS. There is no allocation to the States?

Mr. BYRNS. No.

Mr. KELLER. Why not?

Mr. BYRNS. I do not know, but it just is not the law.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

White House police: Captain, \$3,600; Lieutenant, \$3,050; three sergeants at \$2,750 each; and for 43 privates at rates of pay provided by law; in all \$116,299.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. In debate the other day I called the attention of our colleague from Indiana [Mr. Wood] to the fact that the White House police, 48 in number, were on the Government pay roll, paid for by the United States Government. The gentleman from Indiana contended that they were a part of the Metropolitan police force, and paid for by the District of Columbia, under the District bill. I want to call the gentleman's attention—because he is present on the floor—to the fact that he was in error. These 48 policemen are paid for by the Government of the United States. They are provided for in this Government appropriation bill, and in the paragraph which I have moved to strike out—and which pro forma motion I will withdraw, because the White House must have police—it is specified as follows:

White House police: Captain, \$3,600; Lieutenant, \$3,050; three sergeants at \$2,750 each; and 43 privates at rates of pay provided by law.

The basic salary is \$2,100 per year, with an increase of \$100 for each year's service and after three years' service they get \$2,400 a year, with all of their other privileges. And the next paragraph appropriates \$3,500 additional for their uniforms for one year.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Does the gentleman know when it was they were transferred and their salaries paid out of this appropriation?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; a change was made. They were originally taken from the park police. But the park police are United States policemen and are controlled by an Army officer who is designated as the superintendent of park police. And they are all under the supervision of another Army officer, Col. U. S. Grant, 3d. It was from this park police that White House police were originally transferred to the White House and they have always been charged to the Government of the United States.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman is mistaken and I will tell him wherein he is mistaken. The gentleman is correct in saying they were transferred from the park police, but the gentleman will find that the park police are paid out of District appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. With the Federal contribution of \$9,500,000 made for this fiscal year out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. And at the time the White House policemen were taken from the park police force they were paid out of that same fund.

Mr. BLANTON. How long is it since they have been paid wholly out of the United States Treasury? All of this \$116,299 for their pay one year and the \$3,500 for their uniforms contained in this bill comes out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, it was done at the request of Mrs. Harding. They were transferred from the park police force to a separate force for service at the White House. It was at Mrs. Harding's special request that this change was made.

Mr. BLANTON. Then under President Harding they have been paid for by the Government; under President Coolidge they have been paid for by the Government; and under President Hoover they have been paid for by the Government. Then for 10 years of Republican rule these 48 policemen, who were transferred, as the gentleman says, at the request of Mrs. Harding, from the District pay roll to the Government pay roll, have been rendering service at the

White House and have been paid for out of the Treasury of the United States?

If they were necessary, I would not hesitate at all to appropriate the money; but I do not believe 48 policemen are necessary to guard the White House in peace time.

Mr. BYRNS. Was there a reduction in the number of metropolitan policemen when these men were transferred to the White House force?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly not. We have nearly 1,300 Metropolitan policemen right now, paid for partly by the United States Government, because we do contribute a great sum toward the expenses of the District. In addition to that, we have the park police force under Colonel Grant and that force is partly paid for by the people of the Government. And we have these additional special 48 White House policemen, in peace times, which for the last 10 years, ever since the Harding administration, have been paid for wholly by the Government of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Regardless of whether there are too many or not enough White House policemen, is it not a fact that the office of President of the United States is a Federal office, so that the police should be paid for by the Federal Government and not by the District?

Mr. BLANTON. I have made no contention that they should not be paid for by the Government. My contention is that 48 special White House policemen in peace time are entirely too many and are not needed, when we remember that we have nearly thirteen hundred Metropolitan policemen and about 100 additional park police, all partly paid for by the Government. It shows extravagance on the part of the last three Republican administrations in this regard.

In the President's Budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, he shows on page A17 thereof that he spent \$2,547 for expenses at his "Executive Mansion, Mount Weather, Va." When he takes an outing at his summer camp he ought to pay the expenses out of his \$75,000 salary and his other allowances and not make the people pay for his outing. We have to pay the expenses for our outings.

I premised my statement with the remark that he did need policemen, and I am willing to appropriate for every one he needs, but he does not need 48 in peace time. Are we not mimicking royalty when we put 48 special policemen on guard at the White House in peace time? It is too many.

Mrs. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield? The 48 are certainly not on duty all the time. You have to guard your White House 24 hours a day, and it seems to me this is the least we can do.

Mr. BLANTON. I would expect that from a loyal Republican.

Mrs. KAHN. A loyal Republican; yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Three 8-hour shifts of 5 policemen each, totaling 15, ought to be sufficient in peace time. But President Hoover has 3 shifts of 18 each, or 48 policemen to guard the White House. The people are asking us to retrench. I wonder if our friend, the distinguished gentleman from California, heard the speech over the radio of Mr. Merle Thorpe, the editor of Nation's Business, the other night?

Mrs. KAHN. No; I did not. He does not happen to be a Member of the House.

Mr. BLANTON. He said Congress must reduce, it must retrench, it must cut down, because the people of the United States are not going to stand for anything else any longer.

Mr. TILSON, Mrs. KAHN, and Mr. COLE of Iowa rose.

Mr. TILSON. Did the gentleman vote for the \$132,000,000 appropriation Saturday?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to first answer my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut, who, I believe, was the best Republican leader we ever had on the floor.



Yes; I voted for that bill, and I will tell the gentleman why.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Was that retrenchment?

Mr. BLANTON. Please do not interrupt me until I answer the gentleman from Connecticut.

It is the only bill we have passed in this Congress that guarantees any real relief to the unemployed—the only one. The \$250,000,000 moratorium bill does not help any. I voted against that. The \$2,000,000,000 so-called reconstruction finance act that puts money into the coffers of busted railroads is not going to help the people. I voted against that. The \$125,000,000 given to Federal land banks will not help a farmer. I voted against other measures here that will not help the people, but which place added burdens on them, but I did vote for the people's measure—one that will give some relief, and I saw distinguished Republicans on that side of the aisle get up here and try to defeat that bill, which is the only one that promises any real honest to God relief to the people out of jobs back home.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Did not the gentleman vote in favor of reducing the appropriation for roads in the agricultural appropriation bill \$10,000,000?

Mr. BLANTON. That was an entirely different proposition, and I want to say that I followed first my leader, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. BYRNS, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and then my second officer, the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. WOOD.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman did well.

Mr. BLANTON. They made some unanswerable arguments, showing that the money, if appropriated, could not be spent, but you did not have an argument here last Saturday against the bill to relieve public unemployment. You voted against that bill. I helped to pass it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The difference would be only one of degree. If we need \$132,500,000 now, that \$10,000,000 would have helped some.

Mr. BLANTON. We then had appropriated all the States could use, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Have they not more than they can use now?

Mr. BLANTON. No. When the Government advances this \$120,000,000 to the States they will have the money to use. I was in favor of that bill because it is the only real relief that the people out of jobs back home are going to get out of this Congress, and I dare the gentleman's President to veto it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The gentleman from Texas has seen fit to attack the number of policemen that guard the White House and he seeks to charge it up to Republican extravagance because, as he claims, this is the number that not only at present but for the past 10 years has been provided for guarding the White House.

I believe the gentleman from Texas was here when the same number of privates was appropriated for guarding the White House, but they were then park police.

As I stated in the discussion, it was at the instance of Mrs. Harding that the policemen guarding the White House were placed in a separate force. This act went through the House and provided, as I remember it, for 2 or maybe 1 additional private, and, as I recall, 3 additional officers, 2 sergeants and perhaps 1 lieutenant.

For the last quarter of a century there has been this number of privates guarding the White House. These privates are on an 8-hour scale and, certainly, the gentleman from Texas does not wish to compel them to work on a longer basis. He is a believer in the 8-hour scale for policemen as well as for other employees.

This only allows 14 privates to be distributed around the grounds. I know the gentleman on rare occasions has visited White House functions and has seen these policemen on guard, two or three at a gate, and if the gentleman will

just picture the environs of the White House grounds he will realize that 14 policemen distributed about the spacious grounds and at the various gates at all times of the day, and particularly in the evening, are none too many to properly guard the official mansion of the President.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Always, to my friend, when I have the time.

Mr. BLANTON. This one item of White House police is costing the people \$116,299, and their uniforms for one year an additional \$3,500, and I want to call my friend's attention to the fact that for the year 1921, when President Wilson was in the White House, the total expenses for the White House, as pointed out by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], were \$293,680 per annum, whereas for the present year, under President Hoover, they were \$652,179.

Mr. STAFFORD. And never in the history of the Government has the Executive been doing so much executive work as is now being done by the present Executive. The gentleman may criticize the expenditure that has mounted from the time of President Wilson, nevertheless the gentleman knows that the present organization of the White House is the most efficient in the administration of the duties of the Executive that has ever been carried on in the history of the Government.

True, President Hoover has increased the number of his secretaries. At first there was but one. President Roosevelt's secretary was Mr. Loeb, a very capable man. He was with a dynamic President. We have now a dynamic President. [Laughter.] Oh, the Democrats may laugh and deride, but nevertheless if gentlemen were acquainted with the tremendous burden President Hoover has labored under and the manner in which he performs his onerous duties, they would know that he is a superhuman man. He has a full man's job on his hands. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman from Wisconsin has made an unanswerable argument in regard to the police, but since he got on the subject of the President's three secretaries, when Coolidge and Harding and Wilson and all of his predecessors had but one, I think the gentleman is on thin ice.

Mr. STAFFORD. And yet the gentleman from Tennessee, when he had the opportunity, did not raise his voice in opposition to the increase of the number of secretaries.

Mr. BYRNS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did fight it at the time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, I think for once the gentleman was in error, for it has been proven that the two additional secretaries were necessary in the work of the President's office. But I am glad that the chairman of the committee approves of my position in regard to the police.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we are getting far afield on a small matter. In order that you may know about the White House police, it was in July, 1930, that they were transferred from the park police of the District to the Secret Service of the Treasury Department.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then the gentleman from Wisconsin was mistaken about it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; that is when they were transferred. It has been demonstrated in tragedy three times that the protection to the President of the United States has not been sufficient. We have lost three Presidents at the hands of assassins because of the want of that protection.

Mr. Wilson realized the danger in which he was living while President of the United States, and was not content to rely on the police, but he had a great many soldiers in and about the White House, and was fearful that that would not be sufficient, so he had iron bars put up at the windows of the White House.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield? That was during war time.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Of course, it was war time.

Mr. BLANTON. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the President's Budget, the President's creature,



recommended to this Congress an appropriation for even an additional number of police. We were asked by the President and his Budget to give \$121,200 for White House police, and the gentleman, who is always alive to the people's interest, would not do that, but he voted for only \$116,299. In other words, the gentleman himself has voted to cut down in this bill the President's Budget nearly \$5,000 for White House police because the gentleman did not think it necessary.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Well, it occurs to me that we are wasting more time than the matter is worth.

Mr. BLANTON. I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that we are paying this money out of the Federal Treasury, \$116,299 for 48 White House police, and for an additional \$3,500 for their uniforms for one year.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes; and it all comes out of the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; the taxpayers are paying it, but they are getting tired of it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the acquisition of sites or of additional land, commencement, continuation, or completion, of construction in connection with any or all projects authorized under the provisions of sections 3 and 5 of the public buildings act, approved May 25, 1926 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 40, secs. 343-345), and the acts amendatory thereof approved February 24, 1928 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 40, sec. 345), and March 31, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. IV, title 40, secs. 341-349), within the respective limits of cost fixed for such projects, \$108,000,000, of which not to exceed \$15,000,000 may be expended for buildings in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation for the construction of public buildings shall be used for remodeling and reconstructing the Department of State Building under the authorization thereof contained in the act approved July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 907): *Provided further*, That the building authorized for Seguin, Tex., by the act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1602), shall be constructed on the site owned by the Government on that date: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for work on the building for the Coast Guard or some other Government activity (Apex Building), authorized by act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1605).

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert as a part of my remarks a portion of a speech I delivered in Chicago in June, before the progressive Republican conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is that the same speech that the gentleman delivered in my home city during the Christmas holidays?

Mr. PATMAN. It is an entirely different speech.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was not going to object to that speech being inserted in the RECORD, if the gentleman desired.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will listen to what I have to say now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it upon the same general subject?

Mr. PATMAN. No; it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have under consideration the appropriation for the Supervising Architect's Office. In the recent past we have had as Secretary of the Treasury a gentleman who has had a monopoly on aluminum. The Supervising Architect's Office is under the jurisdiction and control of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Supervising Architect can be either hired or discharged by the Secretary of the Treasury. Of course he is subject to the orders of the Secretary of the Treasury at all times. I do not believe that any Secretary of the Treasury should use his office for the purpose of furthering his own private business, and certainly not at the expense of the United States Government or the people of the United States. I have before me

at this time a publication called the Federal Architect. This is volume 2, No. 1, issue of July, 1931, which indicates that the publication was not commenced until the big public-building program was inaugurated in the United States. Then, for some reason or other, there seemed to be a necessity for this particular publication. It is published by the Association of Federal Architects, 410 Treasury Building, Washington, D. C. Remember 410 Treasury Building is a public building and at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. It has as its editor Mr. Edward B. Morris, of the Treasury Department. If you will look at your Congressional Directory and look up Mr. Morris, or call the personnel clerk at the Treasury Department, you will discover that he is the chief architect.

This particular issue has on page 3, for instance, a picture of the United States post office at Kansas City, Mo. It shows a detail study of colonnade with high-lighted cast aluminum for the ornamental fillings between columns. Then there is an article on the subject of aluminum in modern architecture, showing how aluminum can be used in public buildings. On page 8, in the issue of July, 1931, there is another public building, and on page 9 we find the article, Aluminum in Modern Architecture. That article is written by Mr. McGill, of the Aluminum Co. of America, and shows how aluminum will be used for the ornamental fillings between columns of a certain building of which it shows a picture. On page 10 there is a continuation of that article and how aluminum can be used in public buildings. On page 11 there is a picture of the United States post office at Boston, Mass., showing how aluminum is used for all windows, spandrels, and doorways and stating that the exterior facing is granite, and so forth.

Of course, I do not say that this publication was primarily for the purpose of telling the architects that they should use aluminum. I do not say that it was a mandate to the private architects of America that they should specify aluminum in drawing their plans and specifications for public buildings, but I do say that it doubtless resulted in just exactly what I have suggested may have happened. On page 21 there is another article about aluminum. This edition is devoted largely, though not wholly, to showing the private architects in America how they can use aluminum in the construction of public buildings. Remember that the Supervising Architect is under the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department, under the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury, of course, has gone out and employed many private architects in this building program in order that the work could be expedited. Along with the hiring of these additional architects this publication showed up and was sent to the architects of America in order that they may know that they could use aluminum for different purposes in the construction of public buildings in America.

I do not think the office should be used for any such purpose as that. Of course, this is only one of the small things, but should be mentioned in connection with this bill. In Pittsburgh, Pa., there is a Federal reserve bank building, and if you will notice the specifications for that building you will find that it has more aluminum in it, I suspect, than any other one building that has been erected anywhere in this section of the country. When contractors were asked to bid on the construction of that building, the Mellon-Steuart Co. was found to be the low bidder for the purpose of constructing the building.

The Mellon-Steuart Co. is largely owned by A. W. Mellon, who was Secretary of the Treasury at that time and was also chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Other bidders could not compete with the Mellon-Steuart Co. There was too much aluminum used in the construction of that building, and they had a monopoly on aluminum, and if you will search the records you will find that the Mellon-Steuart Construction Co. received the contract to construct the building. In fact, I have a letter here from the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, D. C., and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.



The letter referred to is as follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD,  
Washington, February 11, 1932.

Mr. H. H. B. MEYER,  
Director Legislative Reference Service,  
Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 10, and you are advised that the general contract for the construction of the building of the Pittsburgh branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland was awarded to the Mellon-Steuart Co., of Pittsburgh, which was the low bidder.

While several comparatively small contracts were also awarded covering miscellaneous items not included in the general contract, it is understood that the inquiry made of you relates to the latter.

Very truly yours,

CHESTER MORRILL, Secretary.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Of course the Federal Government has nothing to do with the building of Federal reserve bank buildings.

Mr. PATMAN. But the Federal Reserve Board, of which Mr. Mellon was chairman by virtue of his position as Secretary of the Treasury, passes on all plans and specifications, and the expenditure of such funds and all of the funds which the Federal reserve banks do not expend after a certain dividend is paid go into the Public Treasury.

Mr. BACON. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Empire State Building in New York City has used more aluminum than any other building, and that is managed by Al Smith.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree there are some private buildings using aluminum, but nothing like the public buildings. The Secretary of the Treasury had charge of the construction of the public buildings, and the gentleman will discover that more aluminum has been used in the construction of public buildings since he became Secretary of the Treasury than ever before.

I know of a case in Hot Springs, Ark., where a man went there to bid on the screens for a public building. He wanted to put the screens on the building. He traveled 125 miles to make a bid. He discovered that the specifications called for aluminum frames and he could not possibly bid, and he had to go back home. In Florida there is another case like that, where aluminum was specified in place of wood and steel.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. In just a moment I will.

Remember that material is being specified, displacing wood and steel, where there is competition in the furnishing of those materials, but there is no competition in the furnishing of aluminum, and the aluminum price was controlled by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Is it possible that aluminum, as a building material, has very great merit and that it wins its place by merit?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it should win by merit and not by political advantage.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. In the post-office building in my district that specification was written, and we got them to change it and include brass and bronze.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The gentleman states aluminum is being used very generally now in the construction of buildings because it has become cheap. A few years before Mr. Mellon became Secretary of the Treasury you could hardly afford to buy an aluminum vessel. Now you can get the same vessel in the 5-and-10-cent store.

Mr. PATMAN. It is not as cheap as it should be. It is protected by a high protective tariff.

I have mentioned one of the small things in connection with Mr. Mellon's activities, because the discussion was in order in the consideration of the bill now before the House. I now desire to discuss briefly the impeachment charges against the Secretary of the Treasury. While the Judiciary Committee was considering the charges the President appointed Mr. Mellon ambassador to England. The appointment was made within 24 hours after the printed hearings before the Judiciary Committee were available. It also came on the heels of Mr. Mellon's answer to the committee that he had sold his bank stock to his brother, R. B. Mellon, just before accepting the office of Secretary. It was a violation of the law for him to hold that office and also own bank stock, so he claims to have sold his stock to his brother, but resigned before the committee had an opportunity to investigate. The Pittsburgh, Pa., telephone directory discloses that during the time he was Secretary the joint office of A. W. and R. B. Mellon was in the Mellon National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., telephone, Atlantic 5800. This was also the Mellon National Bank telephone number. In a lawsuit involving the Aluminum Co. of America Mr. Mellon was a witness. This was in 1928. He was asked if he received any of the additional stock that was issued. He replied that he did not know. He was then asked if his brother, R. B. Mellon, received any of it. His answer was, "I do not know, but if he did I received some of it, too." This shows the close relationship between the one who is supposed to have sold the bank stock and the one who was supposed to have purchased it.

The World's Work, a magazine for March, 1932, discloses in an article entitled "My Brother and I," that the Mellon family owns and controls about \$8,000,000,000 worth of property. Remember, we have much less than half this much money in circulation in the entire United States today. Remember, too, that his companies are using their surplus funds to buy up distressed properties belonging to their competitors that are ruined by this man-made depression.

Aluminum is highly protected by the tariff for Mr. Mellon's benefit. Oil has no tariff for Mr. Mellon's benefit.

I will not enumerate the impeachment charges. The printed hearings before the committee are available. I will give you my conclusions, which are fully authorized.

The President's action in appointing Mr. Mellon ambassador to England while impeachment charges were pending in the House was equal to granting a pardon to the accused while the jury is out.

My object in bringing impeachment charges against the Secretary of the Treasury was to get him out of that office, believing that he is an enemy of the plain people and that his policies have destroyed and are destroying an equal opportunity for individual citizens. No cyclone, plague, or epidemic of disease has wrought such havoc and caused such misery and suffering among people of a civilized nation as have been caused by this man's policies practiced upon a helpless people while they were undefended by their Chief Executives.

President Hoover, it is said, is the best President England has ever had. Now President Hoover is sending to England as our ambassador one who is recognized as England's best friend in America—excepting, of course, the President. We naturally think of the debt England owes us on loans secured during and after the war. He will get the United States to cancel its debt against England. I do not know what his reward will be. He secured for one of his companies a two-billion dollar oil concession in Colombia while he was Secretary of the Treasury.

Everybody knows that the ambassadorship was given to Mr. Mellon to get rid of him. It represents flight under fire, which is typical of the Harding appointees. Not only is he being run out of office, but he is being run out of the country. He is succeeded by a man who is thoroughly schooled in Mellon principles.



Our country has been suffering from "Mellonitis." The President, in an endeavor to protect the "melson," has partly relieved our country of "Mellonitis" without the operation that was about to be performed. The appointment, however, is a subterfuge for the purpose of saving the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Republican Party.

Our penitentiaries and jails are filled with people who have been convicted of offenses against the laws of the States and Nation on proof not so convincing and for crimes that were minor and insignificant compared with the proof against Mr. Mellon on serious offenses.

The President probably concluded that the people could not stand at this time the exposure of true conditions surrounding the activities of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The President has appointed himself a committee of one to exonerate Mr. Mellon, thereby removing the jurisdiction of the case from the House of Representatives.

The pardon has saved the Republican Party from a scandalous exposure that would rock the pillars of our Government. Teapot Dome was a molehill compared with the Mellon-acquired \$2,000,000,000 Barco concession in Colombia.

Mr. Mellon has the consolation of knowing that he has violated more laws and that his policies have caused more suicides, undernourished children, and human suffering, and he has illegally acquired more property and done the most damage to the general welfare of the people than any other person on earth without fear of punishment, and with the sanction and approval of three Chief Executives of a civilized nation. As he goes to England with his bag of gold that has been wrenched from his innocent victims in America, our people may enjoy a sigh of relief and turn their thoughts to rebuilding our Nation for the benefit of the plain people—the ones who build our country in time of peace and who save our country in time of war.

Being successful of ridding our country of the active Mellon rule, it is almost as big a victory as wresting the Magna Charta from King John at Runnymede. Let us hope that his successor will not carry out his policies.

When Mr. Mellon was about to take the oath as ambassador he made this significant statement: "This isn't a marriage ceremony; it is a divorce."

The private debts of international bankers must be paid, according to the Mellonites.

Permission having been granted, I insert the following speech, delivered by myself, Member of Congress from the first congressional district of Texas, at Chicago, Ill., June 12, 1931, at 8 p. m., to a mass meeting arranged by the progressive Republicans of Illinois.

#### MELLONISM

Our country is suffering from an overdose of Mellonism. Our people are in the clutches of organized greed. The sponsors of the movement that brought on this depression and aggravated its condition upon the people are followers of the Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon. Let us call them by their proper name. They are "Mellonites," regardless of whether they call themselves Democrats or Republicans. The three M's, to wit, Mellon, Morgan, and Mills, rate about 99 per cent on the question of running and controlling our Government. The three M's may well be said to represent, so far as the plain people and good government are concerned, misery, misfortune, and malfeasance. With all due respect to the President of the United States—for he is a victim of the reactionary leaders of the party to which he belongs—he is not the man who controls the policies and principles of the present administration. So far as his power goes, he is very little more than a mere hireling. Mr. Mellon is running this country, so far as the administration in power is concerned.

If Mr. Mellon's policies had been submitted to a vote of the people they would have been defeated by almost a unanimous vote. However, his policies have been put into effect through the administration in power contrary to the people's wishes. His policies have carried thousands of good, honest men and women to premature graves, caused suicides and starvation, wrecked and ruined homes and business institutions, and have caused children in many sections of this country to be underfed and undernourished.

Predatory wealth is in control of our Nation, and will remain in control as long as the present Secretary of the Treasury remains in office. This man is often referred to as the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Alexander Hamilton. Those deluded citizens who really believe that must consider causing misery and distress to millions and placing tens of millions of people in a half-starved condition a great achievement. If one uses such a false standard to measure greatness, the Secretary of the Treasury

should be hailed as the savior of our Nation. According to my view, he is the wage earners', farmers', veterans of all wars', and plain people's worst enemy in official life. He has not served under three Presidents, as many would have you to believe, but three Presidents have served under him. He doubtless accumulated more money during the World War, and by reason of the country's misery and misfortune, than any other war profiteer. Mellonism is an issue in our country, and will remain the issue until the plain people are given an opportunity to work and earn a living, to enjoy comforts and necessities of life, and are given the rights and privileges they are entitled to receive as American citizens. Mellonism represents the essence of organized greed.

If anyone makes a fight against monopolies, trusts, and predatory wealth—which is really Mellonism—in favor of wage earners, farmers, defenders of our country in time of war and their dependents, and the plain people generally, he will be compelled to submit to abuse in the way of unfavorable publicity from the Mellonites of the Nation.

Organized greed is blind. The thought of "killing the goose that laid the golden egg" never occurs to them because they have no vision. The Good Book says that where there is no vision the people perish. During the last 10 years of Mellonism our country has been drifting without leadership, but in charge of organized greed. He who serves his generation must be in advance of it. The Mellonites, thinking only of self and personal gain, care nothing for the future generation. They are blinded by a screen of gold.

In 1921, when Mr. Mellon entered office, we had plenty of money in circulation; wages and products of the farm, orchard, and ranch were high. He wanted the reverse to be true. He has succeeded in making it so. We now have cheap labor and products, but high money, thereby making the rich richer and the poor poorer. Such a course has caused debts contracted when times were good to be doubled because it requires doubly amount of work to pay the debts. Interest rates have been doubled because it requires doubly amount of work to pay the interest. Taxes have been doubled, although the figures remain the same, because it requires doubly the amount of work to pay the taxes. Telephone, electric-light, water, and gas bills are doubled because it requires doubly the amount of work to pay the bills. This error which has been so expensive to the people can be corrected.

#### IMPEACHMENT OF MELLON

I announced some time ago that when Congress meets I expect to file in the House of Representatives impeachment charges against the Secretary of the Treasury. The only constitutional and legal way to oust a public official from public office is for the House to impeach him and the Senate to sit as a jury for the purpose of trial and convict him of the charges. Much has been said in the past about the legal disqualifications of Mr. Mellon to hold the office of Secretary of the Treasury, but never before has anyone announced a plan for his impeachment, which, if carried out, would get results. Heretofore, such agitation has been in a body that was powerless to act—the Senate of the United States.

Section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States provides as follows:

"No person appointed to the office of Secretary of the Treasury . . . shall directly or indirectly be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce or be the owner in whole or in part of any sea vessel . . . and every person who offends against any of the prohibitions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a high misdemeanor and forfeit to the United States the penalty of \$3,000 and shall, upon conviction, be removed from office and forever thereafter be incapable of holding any office under the United States . . ."

Senator McKELLAR, March 5, 1929, introduced a resolution in the Senate, which was adopted, requiring the Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into and report to the Senate whether Andrew W. Mellon may legally hold the office of Secretary of the Treasury. No action was ever taken on the report of that committee. The reason is evident. The Senate could not adopt the report of the Members who believed Mr. Mellon to be qualified to hold the office because that would be, in effect, prejudging a case which they had no right to pass on. The Senate can only pass on the qualifications of a public official in the event articles of impeachment are presented by the House of Representatives. The Senate could not adopt the report or take any action on the report submitted by the members of the committee who reported that Mr. Mellon was holding office in violation of the law. The adoption of such a report would have no effect whatever and would merely be prejudging any case of impeachment that the House might later submit.

When the House is organized I expect to submit the question of impeachment of Mr. Mellon. Under the rules of the House of Representatives, such a resolution will be privileged. The customary gag rule of the reactionary Republicans can not be used. They will be compelled to face the issue.

Positive proof of Mr. Mellon's disqualifications will be presented to the House of Representatives. I do not see how any Member can vote against his impeachment without, at the same time, violating his own oath of office, because Mr. Mellon, in holding the office of Secretary of the Treasury, is violating the laws of the United States. As suggested in the report of Senators NORRIS, CARAWAY, WALSH, and BLAINE, holding Mr. Mellon disqualified, "Law enforcement should commence at the top." The following is a part of what they said on law enforcement in connection with this subject:



## "LAW ENFORCEMENT"

"Just at the present time a great deal is being said about law enforcement. From the public press it is learned that the President of the United States has appointed, or is about to appoint, a commission to study the subject with a view of bringing about better enforcement of our laws. If we expect to enforce the law generally as to the citizens of our country, why have we not the same right to ask that our statesmen and our public officials should be weighed in the same balance? And is it not true that the ordinary citizen will not have the same respect for law generally if he understands that a plain statute is being violated by those in control of the Government itself? Why not begin our law enforcement at the top?"

Without going into details I will say that it is admitted that Mr. Mellon and his brothers completely dominate and control one of the largest corporations of its kind in the world. Such corporation or holding company has a large number of subsidiaries not only in this country but in many foreign countries. This concern owns 34 sea vessels. No one can possibly contend that Mr. Mellon, as owner of one-third of this corporation, is not a part owner of a sea vessel in violation of section 243 of title 5 of the Code of Laws of the United States of America. Of course, the resolution calling for his impeachment will contain other charges and all of them will be well supported by facts.

Mr. Mellon was a director in more than 300 corporations at the time he was appointed Secretary of the Treasury. He resigned as director and contends that since he is only a voting stockholder of these corporations he is not interested or concerned in carrying on their business either directly or indirectly. Many of his concerns are interested directly in the tariff, in the levying and collection of Federal taxes, and in shipping products upon the high seas. He has granted to his corporations millions of dollars in tax refunds. Recently Hon. C. N. Haskell, former Governor of Oklahoma, made this statement: "Usually brothers and cousins of Mr. Mellon are known to the business as directors and managers of his numerous corporations. But he is the big share owner and presses the button."

If we are successful in ridding our country of Mr. Mellon's rule, it will be as big a victory as wresting the Magna Charta from King John at Runnymede.

## CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH

Senator BORAH says that 80 per cent of the wealth of our Nation is owned by 4 per cent of the people. A cartoon was recently published in Labor, a newspaper of national wide circulation, as follows:

"Let five apples represent all the wealth in the Nation. Let 100 people represent the entire population of the United States. The 96 people would have one apple and four very rich people would have an apple apiece."

During the year of 1929, the last year we have a statistical income-tax report, the net earnings of 504 individuals in the United States amounted to as much as the total gross value of all the cotton and wheat produced in America during the year of 1930. Thirty-six of these individuals had a net income greater than the total gross value of all the farm products produced by all the farmers in Texas, the greatest agricultural State in the Union during 1930. Mr. Mellon is the head of the Federal reserve system. Money is to the body politic what blood is to the human body. We have in our Nation to-day \$1,000,000,000 less money in circulation than we had in 1920, although we have 17,000,000 more people in the United States to-day than we had in 1920. The per capita circulation of money has reduced from \$53 in 1921 to \$36 now. One had just as well expect his body to remain well and efficient after the withdrawal of one-third of his circulating blood as to expect his country to remain prosperous after the withdrawal from circulation of one-third of the country's money. In 1873, during one of the hardest panics the United States has ever suffered, France was prosperous because she had more than \$40 of money per capita in circulation. The people of the United States were hard pressed because they had a much smaller amount of money in circulation. Since 1929, France has been prosperous and has been importing laborers into her country because she had more than \$50 per capita money in circulation. During the same time, the people of the United States have been suffering, and more laborers have been leaving our country than have been coming in, because our per capita circulation has been one-third less than the per capita circulation of money in France. Mr. Mellon, as the dominating and controlling power of the Federal reserve system, has more to do with the per capita circulation of money than any other one person in America.

## EQUALIZING THE BURDENS OF THE LAST WAR

I am not, at this time, thinking so much about equalizing the burdens of the next war. Many of the large fortunes, from which incomes from \$1,000,000 to \$60,000,000 a year are now being made, were accumulated during the World War by reason of the country's misery and misfortune. During this time, 5,000,000 men were baring their breasts to enemies' bullets, and offering to give their last drop of blood for the cause of their country, without the payment of any profit whatsoever or without hope of financial reward. We have the names and addresses, and know the approximate amounts accumulated by these individuals during the World War. Why should we look to other sources of revenue to pay the expenses of the last war until this source of revenue that should be used for that purpose is, in a large measure, exhausted? It is yet possible to make the war profiteers of the last war pay the larger part, if not all, of the expenses of that war.

If, in carrying out the purpose of making the profiteers of the last war pay its expenses, it is found to be expensive and burdensome upon the class that now holds the greater portion of the wealth of our Nation, a future war will be less likely. I believe that he who profits most should pay most.

## DEPRESSION

The word "depression" is used while the Republicans are in power and the word "panic" is considered more fitting while the Democrats are in power. The following recently appeared in the Pathfinder, a national publication, written by J. G. Calhoun, Julia, Ga.:

"There are many Hoovercrats standing in the bread line. You can tell them by their foolish expression. Hoover had us on short rations once before. He has us there again and it looks like he is going to keep us there."

During the Hoover campaign, the people of the United States were led to believe that in the event of his election he would open up wonderful foreign markets and the people of the United States could produce twice as much and still not supply the demand. Consequently, the early part of 1929, people all over the United States commenced to put their money in the stock market. The big rich, the owners of the stock, knew that there were no foreign markets and fed their stocks to the anxious investors, who were fooled by the foreign-markets propaganda. The theme song of Wall Street is "Bringing in the Sheep." When the stocks were finally owned principally by the small investors and America's vast middle-class citizenship and they were forced to commence buying from one another, the market broke and now the ultrarich can repurchase their stocks for 10 per cent to 50 per cent of what they sold them for in the latter part of 1929.

Mr. Hoover recently made a speech in which he stated that the war caused the depression. Did the World War take money out of circulation? No. Did the World War destroy independent business institutions in this country, perpetrate monopolies and trusts, and destroy individual opportunity? No.

Mr. Mellon recently made a speech, which was devoid of any cure for the depression. The crowd that Mr. Mellon wants to see prosper is prospering now. He can't promise them any more prosperity than they are now enjoying. A famous card player used to say, when he was prospering and the losers were complaining about his cheating in a game of poker, "It is music to the gambler's ears to hear the suckers squeal." Doubtless it is music to Mr. Mellon's ears to hear the cries of men, women, and children in the agony of their distress and agony brought on by his activities, which is lining his pockets with gold.

## TRUSTS AND MONOPOLIES

A trust is a combination to restrict competition and create a monopoly. A monopoly has such a control of a commodity as to allow prices to be raised.

Mr. Mellon's administration does not believe in enforcing the laws against his big companies that are violating the antitrust laws of our Nation. The Attorney General of the United States is another one of his satellites. The Attorney General never brings a suit against the violators of the antitrust laws in a way that anyone will be compelled to go to jail or pay a fine in the event the Government wins the suit. It is always one of these "friendly suits" to test the law—a law that has been tested in more ways than any other law upon our statute books. An Attorney General who doesn't know the antitrust laws after reading the numerous decisions that fill volumes of law books on the act should be impeached for incompetency. The Attorney General has engaged in a "wrist-slapping" campaign with trusts and monopolies and is using his office and the courts of the United States as an agency of convenience for their benefit.

## WHAT A TRUST OR A MONOPOLY CAN DO AND WHAT THEY ARE DOING

1. Destroy independent business.
2. Cut wages and cause a lower standard of living.
3. Unduly increase the price that the consumer must pay.
4. Place their factories in different sections of the world or in different sections of the United States in order that labor may be effectively dealt with. In one plant where laborers demand better wages or better working conditions, they are told to be satisfied or that particular plant will be closed down and another one in a different section where the laborers can be more easily dealt with will be operated.
5. Pay the president of a company \$2,000,000 a year and even directors \$300,000 a year, entirely out of proportion to the value of the services rendered.
6. Set low prices on the raw materials so that these big salaries and other extravagant expenses can be paid.
7. Take money out of circulation and hoard it in the banks of New York. One certain monopoly has \$400,000,000 on deposit in New York now. It is not in circulation. This concern represents what was formerly 5,000 different unit companies in the United States. If the 5,000 different units had this money now, it would be in circulation and not hoarded in the banks of one big city.
8. Inflate values of their properties and require the people to pay a return upon watered stocks and bonds.
9. Place property rights above human rights.

## UNEMPLOYMENT

More than 7,000,000 people in the United States to-day are able, willing, and anxious to work, but can not find jobs. The American people are not lazy. They are accused of producing too much. It looks like they produce so much to eat they starve. They produce so much to wear they can not buy clothes. If the plain



people of our Nation are allowed to prosper, everybody will prosper. We can not longer depend upon prosperity coming from the billionaire class; it falls to percolate through on down to the masses. There is a feeling that a man has a right to steal rather than that he or his family should suffer the pains and penalties of hunger and poverty when he is anxious, able, and willing to work but can not find a job. If Congress would meet and the Members would forget political parties and think of their country's welfare, laws could be passed within a period of a few weeks that would give everybody a job who wanted a job and put our country back in a prosperous condition. The unemployed could be put to work building highways, waterways, and public buildings. This is not going to be done if the Mellonites can prevent it. It would possibly cost the 4 per cent who own the Nation's wealth a little money.

The appeals for a special session when made to Mr. Hoover are made to the wrong person. It is useless to present such appeals to Mr. Mellon. It would be much easier to convert Clarence Darrow to the cause of Christianity than it would be to convert Mr. Mellon to the cause of the plain people. Mr. Mellon and many of his coconspirators against the public welfare are reputed to be enjoying incomes of from thirty to fifty million dollars a year. This is reputed to be their net incomes. I doubt that Mr. Mellon ever witnessed people suffering distress or poverty. Any man who sees men, women, and children in distress has a soft heart. An income of \$30,000,000 a year is equal to an income of \$100,000 for each working day. Mr. Mellon's salary as Secretary of the Treasury is \$15,000 a year.

#### COUNTRY ABOVE PARTY

Every good citizen should think more of his country than he does any political party. The Mellonites think more of the reactionary Republican crowd because they are using that organization to promote their selfish and organized greed to the detriment and distress of the plain people—the ones who build our country in time of peace and who save it during the time of war.

#### ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATES

Three million five hundred thousand veterans of the World War, who served longer than 110 days, hold adjusted-service certificates. The average value of each certificate is \$1,010. Congress recently passed an act which permitted each veteran whose certificate has been issued more than two years to borrow an amount equal to 50 per cent of the face value thereof. Under this act and under the old law which permitted the veterans to borrow a small sum each year, approximately a billion dollars have been borrowed by the veterans from the Government on their certificates. This money has relieved much distress among veterans and helped the country by increasing the circulating medium. Much is being said about our present deficit in the United States Treasury and some newspapers and periodicals are trying to lead the people to believe that the deficit is caused by the veterans' loan bill. This is absolutely false. Not one dime of this deficit was caused by the Government loaning to the veterans a part of their own money. There was already in the Treasury approximately \$800,000,000 in a reserve fund to retire these certificates upon death of the holders or maturity, which doubtless was used to make these loans. That amount, together with what was borrowed from the war-risk insurance fund, was sufficient to make loans without going to the Treasury for a penny.

Do not call the adjusted-service certificates a "bonus" unless you call them a "so-called bonus." I will admit that the word "bonus" is the popular name, but a very misleading one. The word was coined by the enemies of the veterans. The adjusted-service certificates do not represent a bonus. They represent an honest debt, which has been publicly confessed by the Congress of the United States to these veterans of the World War for services rendered.

During the war the private soldiers received \$30 a month for home service and a 10 per cent increase for service overseas. But each soldier had deducted from his pay each month allotments to dependent ones; deductions for altering and repairing his clothing and shoes; deductions for laundry, tailoring, and barber bills; deductions of an average of \$6.60 a month for insurance; deductions for installments on Liberty bonds. A majority of soldiers drew only a few dollars a month after these deductions were made, and a large percentage did not draw anything at all.

During the war, alien slackers and alien enemies in America, who were exempt from military service, received from \$15 to \$70 a day working in Government shipyards and munition plants. More than 33,000 millionaires were made during the World War, and by reason of the country's misery and misfortune.

During the war, many soldiers worked on the public roads in America, side by side with civilians. Immediately after the war was over, Congress passed a law which adjusted the pay of these soldiers, sailors, and marines on road-construction work. The corporal, who drew \$1.66½ a day, who was used as a tractor mechanic, side by side with a civilian, who drew \$8 a day, had his pay adjusted and he received adjusted pay equal to \$6.33 a day for each day he so worked, or \$158.25 a month. I have in my possession a copy of one of the pay rolls. It is included in my remarks made in the House of Representatives, January 17, 1931.

The railroads were drafted into the service during the World War. They were guaranteed a profit equal to the average returns of the railroads during the preceding three years—the most prosperous time of railroading in America. This is a case of where property rights were guaranteed a return and a fair return. Not satisfied with this, the railroad owners persuaded Congress to give them adjusted pay after the war was over which

amounted to money and property of the value of more than \$1,500,000,000. Remember, this was adjusted pay for the railroads. They were paid in cash or its equivalent.

More than 7,000 war contractors, who did not hold legal contracts from the Government to make supplies during the war, but most of whom held verbal contracts from the dollar-a-year men, who represented in many instances the industries controlled and owned by these dollar-a-year men, persuaded Congress to adjust their pay. Congress passed a law which provided for the adjustment of their pay, and under this law billions of dollars of adjusted compensation was paid out to these war contractors. Mr. Mellon received his millions from these adjustments.

A large part of the money that was raised through Liberty loan drives in America during the war was loaned to our allies. After the war Congress adjusted these debts and gave to these foreign nations what was equal to an outright gift or subsidy from the Treasury of the United States equal to \$10,000,000,000. These foreign countries used our own money to pay their World War soldiers not only adjusted compensation but bonuses aggregating in some instances as high as \$7,290 each.

Congress felt disposed to give our soldiers adjusted compensation. A law was passed in 1924 confessing a debt to each veteran of the World War who served more than 60 days of a dollar a day for home service and \$1.25 a day for service overseas for extra compensation or extra pay. Veterans who served more than 60 days but less than 110 days were paid in cash. By reason of false statements made by the Secretary of the Treasury, who is the present occupant of that position, Congress was led to believe in 1924 that our Nation could not afford to pay this debt in cash. Consequently, the veterans were given a Government's "I O U," or post-dated check, or due bill, due in 20 years—1945—sometimes referred to as the "tombstone bonus."

This debt should have been paid in cash, and had it not been for the false statements of the Secretary of the Treasury, I am sure it would have been. The railroads, war contractors, and foreign nations were well taken care of when our country owed a \$26,000,000,000 national debt. No one suggested we were not able to take care of these payments. Years later, when our national debt had been decreased considerably, the Secretary of the Treasury contended that the Treasury of the country could not possibly stand the payment of the debt to the soldiers for services rendered.

Congress, more than 10 years ago, outlined, by law, how our national debt should be retired. Had Mr. Mellon followed this law, instead of having a billion dollar deficit in the Treasury today, we would have a two and one-half billion dollar surplus. I heard the Secretary of the Treasury admit, in answer to a question before the Senate committee in January of this year, that he had paid three and one-half billion dollars more on the national debt during the past decade than Congress, by law, said that he should pay. Our national debt has been reduced from \$26,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000 the last 10 years. We owe less than any country on earth in proportion to wealth. Three and one-half billion dollars is the amount of the aggregate face value of all the adjusted-service certificates. If we pay them in full now, our country will not be in debt one dime more than Congress said 10 years ago it should be in debt at this time.

Our Nation has a property valuation of more than \$500,000,000,000. There is a balance due on the adjusted service certificates of about two and one-half billion dollars, equal to one-half of 1 per cent of our total property valuation.

During the last few years, Mr. Mellon has refunded to the United States Steel Corporation, Aluminum Company of America and other war profiteers billions of dollars in taxes claimed to have been overpaid during the World War. When the United States Steel Corporation was refunded more than a hundred million dollars, it was also paid interest on the amount alleged to have been overpaid from the time that it was overpaid at 6 per cent. If we will pay the veterans of the World War the amount that Congress confessed was due as of the time the services were rendered, with 6 per cent interest since that time compounded annually, the full face value of the certificates is due now. The veterans have been paying 6 per cent interest and more compounded annually for their own money. It would therefore not be unfair for the Government to pay them 6 per cent compounded annually.

The individuals who profited the most by reason of our country's misery and misfortune during the recent war should be compelled to pay this bill. It can be paid without changing our tax laws or increasing our taxes in any way. The money will go to every nook and corner of the United States. It will increase the circulating medium, which will carry with it increased purchasing power. It must be paid sometime. It is due now, and it will do the veterans and the country the most good if paid now.

One certain weekly magazine has bitterly opposed the Government paying this honest debt and has criticized Congress for permitting the veterans to borrow a part of their own money. The stockholders of this particular magazine received 71 per cent dividends on their original investment last year. The magazine was transported by the United States mails. For every 7 cents it cost the Government to transport these magazines the magazine company paid 2 cents and the people paid the other 5. By reason of this direct subsidy to this particular magazine its stockholders were enabled to make a profit of 71 per cent on their original investment. It is people like these who are always talking about the soldiers' bonus or subsidy and referring to their efforts to get an honest debt paid as a "bonus racket." The Government has lost each year tens of millions of dollars on the transportation of



the magazines that are now having so much to say in their columns about Congress authorizing the loan to the veterans of 50 per cent of their own money at 4½ per cent interest. The Government is making millions of dollars a year lending the veterans their own money. The interest charged them will practically consume the remainder of their certificates.

#### WIDOWS AND ORPHANS LAW

When the next session of Congress convenes a determined effort should be made by the veterans of the World War to secure the enactment of a widows and orphans' pension measure for widows and orphans of veterans of the World War. Under the present laws a widow of a Spanish-American War veteran draws \$30 a month, although her husband died of a disability in no way connected with his service. A surviving widow of a veteran of the World War who died of a disability not connected with his service draws nothing. The same injustice prevails with reference to children of deceased veterans of the two wars. This should be corrected by giving widows and orphans of veterans of the World War the same benefits as those now enjoyed by widows and orphans of veterans of the Spanish-American War.

#### GIVE THE PEOPLE THE TRUTH

Voters are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely. The Hon. CORDELL HULL, of Tennessee, recently made this statement:

"If the people, as in the better days of this Republic, would take one night off each week from pleasure and recreation and assemble in every schoolhouse and other convenient buildings in America for a full discussion of our Government—Federal and State and local—the political problems, the conduct and attitude of each public official, I guarantee that government in this Nation would be improved 100 per cent within three years."

Senator HULL is right. I, like Thomas Jefferson, believe in the honesty of the people and believe that all is to be won by appealing to the reason of the voters.

The people are very patient; they are reasonable; what they do after consideration and free discussion is right. They are not going to put up with conditions as they are without entering a serious protest. Several prominent citizens of our Nation have already suggested that we are going to have a revolution, either of ballots or bullets. If the President of the United States fails to call Congress in special session for the purpose of making an effort to remedy conditions, and if the heel of organized greed continues to crush the plain citizens of our country, I shudder to think of what the consequences might be. We have the greatest Government on earth. We are suffering by reason of the wrong governmental philosophy of those at the top. The serious questions we are confronting are not partisan questions and should not be considered in a partisan way. We should rise above party and make an honest effort to solve them. The best citizen thinks more of his country than he does of any political party.

The lines of Gerald Massey are applicable to present conditions:

"Oh men, bowed down with labor,  
Oh women, young yet old,  
Oh hearts oppressed in the toilers' breast  
And crushed with the power of gold.  
Keep on with your weary struggle  
Against triumphant might;  
No question is ever settled  
Until it is settled right."

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ABERNETHY] has to some extent taken the edge off the attack made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] upon Mr. Mellon and has completely exonerated Mr. Wetmore as Acting Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

It was simply Mr. Wetmore's great ability that caused him to be retained in his present position year after year and through administration after administration of both parties. It was his ability as an executive and his thorough understanding of the building business that caused him to be retained in office, but under a technicality of the law, requiring an architect, he could not be appointed supervising architect. So he has continued as Acting Supervising Architect, but it amounts to the same thing so far as his duties are concerned.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. My recollection is, it was in 1916 that a vacancy occurred in the Office of Supervising Architect. Mr. Wetmore had been there a number of years, and I think his profession originally was that of law. He was made Acting Supervising Architect and has been in that position ever since.

Mr. TILSON. And he has been a very capable official, as everyone knows who is acquainted with his work.

Mr. BYRNS. And I happen to know that he has served with particular ability.

Mr. TILSON. I think almost everybody recognizes that fact.

Mr. BYRNS. We have found that to be the fact.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Just for a question, because I wish to turn to another subject for a moment.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Does the gentleman mean to say that if somebody does not qualify under the law that he should be permitted, because of other qualities that may be very superior, to do that which he can not do under the law?

Mr. TILSON. Oh, as Acting Supervising Architect Mr. Wetmore does just the same work he would do as Supervising Architect. It is simply a difference in name and that is all it amounts to.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Does not the gentleman think when the law was passed that it was expected, while the law was permitted to remain on the books, that an architect should fill that position?

Mr. TILSON. The law has remained ever since.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. And that he should possess technical knowledge and experience in that line of work.

Mr. TILSON. I think his ability has been proven.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to revert for a moment to the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

I think the gentleman from Texas puts his talents to very poor use in attacking Andrew W. Mellon. It happens that Mr. Mellon for 11 years served this Nation as Secretary of the Treasury. That his service in that capacity was not only honest, faithful, and efficient, but to a notable degree outstanding in its character is gratefully acknowledged by millions of his fellow citizens.

Before he came to that high position he was engaged in very large business enterprises. He had accumulated a large fortune, so that the amount of his salary as Secretary meant nothing to him, and yet he gave up active connections with all private business in order to serve his country. He came into office with the highest possible qualifications for the duties of the office because his entire business career had been the best possible training for it. The results have been so satisfactory to the people of this country, and especially to the Treasury, that he has been hailed all over the country as one of the greatest Secretaries of the Treasury in all our national history.

He has served this Government for 11 years unstintedly, to the sacrifice of his own business; although perhaps this meant less to him than to most men because of his age and because he had already reached that degree of private fortune that left him no worries so far as a competence is concerned. At any rate, it can not be denied that he gave himself unselfishly and most effectively to his country's service.

As a most fitting recognition of Mr. Mellon's services as Secretary of the Treasury, he has been promoted, as it were, to be ambassador to the Court of St. James. His name went to the Senate for confirmation, and almost without a dissenting voice, certainly without a call for a record vote, he was confirmed by the Senate, the very body that would have had to sit as a court in the trial of the impeachment charges brought by the gentleman from Texas, in his 1-man attack upon the Secretary of the Treasury, had they been presented by the House.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I prefer not to yield. The gentleman had 10 minutes, and I think he used the time for an unworthy purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more. The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will yield for a question.

Mr. TILSON. I shall not promise. The gentleman may object if he wishes.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks for three minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. PATMAN. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but I hope the gentleman will yield to me to ask one question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILSON. I made no promise to yield, but I will yield to the gentleman for one question.

Mr. PATMAN. The same law that disqualified Mr. Mellon as Secretary of the Treasury did not disqualify him as ambassador to the Court of St. James. I hope the gentleman will take that into consideration.

Mr. TILSON. There has never been a law to disqualify Mr. Mellon as Secretary of the Treasury. It seems that the gentleman has worked himself up into such a state of mind in connection with his proposed impeachment charges that his attack hardly deserves answer. It reminds me of an old Yale professor, under whose tutelage I sat for some time. He said that many formidable questions and apparently plausible statements might be answered and completely disposed of by the Yankee device of asking two other questions, and I think the gentleman's argument could very largely be answered in the same way. The two questions are, first, Is what the gentleman states true? If by any means he should be able to establish the truth of the statement or any substantial part of it, then the second question is, What of it?

In the present instance the gentleman has failed to bring a scintilla of evidence that any of his charges or any of his insinuations or innuendos are true; and, in the next place, even if it were true, for instance, that aluminum has been recommended by a certain group of architects as good material for use in building, what of it? Aluminum in its production and use has had a wonderful development. It has proved itself to be a fine material for building, but Mr. Mellon has not been giving his attention to aluminum. He has given himself unstintingly and wholly to the duties of his great office. The idea that Andrew W. Mellon with his record, reputation, and prestige before the American people and the whole world, for that matter, would stultify himself and prostitute the high office of Secretary of the Treasury to the ignoble purpose of private greed is simply too preposterous to be seriously entertained for a moment by any fair-minded person.

Mr. PATMAN. If I did not make a sufficient case against Mr. Mellon before the Judiciary Committee, why did he leave at the time he did?

Mr. TILSON. Because it was just at this time he received the great honor of promotion to the highest position in the diplomatic corps. Evidently neither the President, Mr. Mellon, nor anyone else regarded as worthy of serious attention the vague charges brought by the gentleman. Whether or not the gentleman's attack was calculated to amount to anything if taken to the Senate in the form of impeachment proceedings was pretty thoroughly settled by the same Members of this tribunal who would have had to hear and decide the case, when they almost unanimously—Democrats, Republicans, and others—joined in confirming Mr. Mellon for the highest position in the Diplomatic Service.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman should remember that the committee had to quit the case, because there was nothing else to do. The President appointed him to this office, which was equal to a presidential pardon during trial. The committee could not do anything else.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman's attack had nothing to do with the appointment; but if all the things charged by the gentleman had been true, or it had been believed that there was any foundation whatever for them, the Senate of the United States would not have confirmed him.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph for the purpose of getting recog-

nition. We are on a section having to do with the Supervising Architect. About four years ago the Congress, seeing the necessity for it, authorized an appropriation of \$3,825,000 for the purchase of a site and construction of a public building in St. Louis. The present Federal building was constructed over 50 years ago. We are paying \$70,000 a year in rent to the owners of private buildings in St. Louis to house Government agencies. As time went on and the architect worked on the plans, it was discovered that they would need an additional \$1,245,000 to construct a building sufficient in size to care for the present Government agency in St. Louis. Last summer I took this matter up with the Supervising Architect's Office, and it was placed before the Bureau of the Budget. I was informed that it was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Later on, in view of the condition of the Treasury, the President saw fit to issue orders that no additional legislation was coming down from the Bureau of the Budget at this session of Congress with reference to public buildings. I made some investigation and found that there are 19 projects in the country somewhat similar to the one in St. Louis, and that additional funds will be needed for some of them in order to construct the proper kind of buildings and additional legislation for others. I invited the Members representing the cities where the 19 projects are located to discuss the matter. We went to the Bureau of the Budget and stated our case. The director promised to take the matter up with the President. I then appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and told that committee the situation with reference to these projects, of course especially with reference to my own. I asked the committee if it would not discuss the matter with Mr. Martin, the assistant to Mr. Heath and Mr. Wetmore, when they came before the committee, because, as you all know, the officials of the Government are not permitted to discuss matters not in the Budget recommendations unless the committee brings the subject up. The Committee on Appropriations did as I suggested. I will place the hearings in my extension of remarks. They showed that these are old projects, not new projects, and showed that all that is asked is an authorization, in some instances, for additional money, in others for legislation simply to change the location of the site or something like that. The total amount involved in the 19 projects is \$5,000,000, and not one dollar is asked until 1934; but in order to proceed properly with the plans and specifications, authorization is needed now.

I say, in the interest of economy the Bureau of the Budget should have sent down the recommendation, because if they do not construct the buildings now, especially in St. Louis, where they are going to construct a 6-story building, later, when they provide for the other four stories it will cost much more than \$5,000,000 to complete the work.

Mr. Chairman, it is not only a foolish piece of business, as far as the St. Louis office is concerned, but it is a foolish piece of business as far as every one of the 19 projects are concerned. They are old projects. We do not want a dollar, I say, until 1934. In no way does it affect the balancing of the Budget in 1933. I hope the administration will bring down this recommendation when the deficiency bill is pending. There is one more thing I would like to say about the St. Louis building. When that building is constructed in St. Louis it will cost \$5,000,000 completed. The old building will be sold, and the appraisers say it will bring about \$5,000,000. It is the most valuable block of ground in St. Louis, and the new building is not, in the end, going to cost the Government of the United States one penny.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Since this does not cost any money, why does the gentleman not offer an amendment to put this item in the bill at this time?

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that the expert parliamentarian of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Shield, has advised me that it would be subject to a point of order. Therefore I will not offer the amendment.



Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a brief from the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce upon this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the request of the gentleman is granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks I include the record of the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. You will see the department thinks the legislation necessary, as do the members of the committee, Mr. BYRNS and Mr. WOOD included.

#### PROJECTS WHICH REQUIRE AMENDED LEGISLATION

The CHAIRMAN. I understand there are some 15 large buildings with respect to which a limit of cost has been fixed, but conditions have arisen requiring either additional plans or changes in limits of cost. The St. Louis project was brought to our attention by Congressman COCHRAN of Missouri.

Mr. MARTIN. We have 19 projects which, in the opinion of the department, will require some form of amended legislation sooner or later. These projects are scattered all over the country. I can give you an example of the different categories into which they fall.

The CHAIRMAN. You might tell us where they are.

Mr. MARTIN. I have them in a statement which I am going to furnish for the record. We report those every month.

We have a project in St. Louis and another in St. Paul, very large projects. The estimate of cost which has been authorized contemplated a 6-story building in St. Louis and a 6-story building in St. Paul. As the plans were started, the several departments made a material increase in their space demands. In one of these cities the increase was 37 per cent and in the other 48 per cent. The department has in mind so designing these two buildings that you can add additional stories at some later date, because we can not, of course, exceed the authorization.

At St. Louis it will be necessary to put four additional stories on at some later date, and at St. Paul five additional stories.

Of course, there is a further matter; there will be an additional cost by doing the jobs in two bites, but sooner or later you will need some form of amended legislation to allow us to complete the job to meet the requirements.

Then we have several places where we are about to select the site, but we can not acquire title until we get authority from Congress to accept title subject to rights to mine minerals under the site or an easement that requires the maintenance of a sewer that runs across the site, and so forth.

The absence of that authority is likely to hold up those jobs until we get amended legislation.

Then we have several projects where the present legislation contemplates an addition to the present building. A more thorough study by the architects indicates that that is not the best way to meet that problem, that you probably should consider a new building rather than to expend a large sum on extending and remodeling an old structure.

At Grand Rapids, Mich., we have authority for an extension of the present building of \$300,000. The extension was limited because of the area we had on the Government site to the rear of the present building. The present building is a beautiful building, not so very old. However, we could obtain enough space to meet the requirements at this time. As we started the plans, the city advised us that it was their intention to widen that street at the rear 25 feet and it would have to come off the Government side. That fact absolutely made it necessary to consider some other plan, because we should not expend money for small additions like that, and the building being of marble I believe it would be a very costly proposition. So the more forward-looking solution there is to acquire a site and build a work-type building for the parcel post of the post office and utilize the remaining space in the present building for all other activities. Such a project will take care of the city for a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it be possible, Mr. Martin, for you to take each one of those projects and make a statement as to just why each one is being held up?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

#### "ST. PAUL, MINN.

"Limit of cost authorized, \$2,700,000. Federal activities proposed to be housed in the new building have increased their requirements 37 per cent above the amount on which the present limit of cost was based. To provide this additional space, change facing of building to all stone and install mail-handling apparatus will require an increase in the present limit of cost of \$1,000,000. In the absence of amended legislation, the department will construct a 6-story building so designed that five additional stories may be added at some future date.

#### "PHOENIX, ARIZ.

"Limit of cost, \$1,080,000. Under this legislation it was proposed to acquire a site and construct a building for a post office and a number of other Federal activities excepting the courts, and five other activities which were to remain in the present Federal building after remodeling. Since the estimate for the new building was prepared, Federal activities have increased their requirements 1,400 square feet, and the architectural plans developed show an increase over the original estimate of 11,000 square

feet. The courts have requested air conditioning and space in the proposed new building which can not be furnished unless the present limit of cost is increased \$545,000. The several amounts which would offset this increase would be the cost of remodeling present building, \$40,000; rented quarters during remodeling, \$20,000; sale value of Federal property estimated at \$250,000, and additional cost of adding additional stories at some later date, \$35,000. In the absence of amended legislation, the department proposes to construct a 3-story building so designed that three additional stories may be added at some future date.

#### "HAYRE, MONT.

"Original limit of cost was \$200,000. Amended to provide for courts under limit of cost of \$250,000. The contract was awarded under the original limit in advance of amended legislation, and bids for the additional court space exceeded the new limit by approximately \$46,000. Deduction changes were made in an amount to complete the building within the new limit. Major deductions considered eliminated two wings at the second floor level and the installation of the elevator. A further increase of \$40,000 is necessary to reinstate these omissions.

#### "GRAND ISLAND, NEBR.

"Limit of cost for additional land and extension \$95,000. Federal activities have increased their space requirements nearly 5,000 square feet, necessitating a much larger extension than contemplated under the present legislation. Estimate for additional land was \$25,000. Report of condemnation commission, \$34,500. Increase necessary to furnish all space, \$90,000.

#### "HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

"Limit of cost for additional land and extension, \$390,000. Federal activities have increased their space requirements approximately 9,000 square feet since legislation was obtained. In order to provide this additional space, it is estimated that an increase of \$75,000 in the limit of cost is necessary.

#### "PEORIA, ILL.

"The present legislation contemplates acquisition of additional land and extension to the present building under a limit of cost of \$320,000. Since the legislation was obtained a more thorough examination of the building has been made and the Office of the Supervising Architect considers that the more economical and forward-looking solution at this place is for the acquisition of a larger block of additional land, demolition of the present structure, and the construction of a new building on the present site extended. An increase of \$630,000 will be necessary in the limit of cost to carry out this scheme.

#### "GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

"Limit of cost of \$300,000 contemplated the extension and remodeling of the present building. The city of Grand Rapids proposes to widen the street in the rear of the present post office, which will require a strip off the rear of the present Federal site. Work has been held up on the plans of this extension because of this fact, and it is recognized that the obvious method for accommodating all activities at Grand Rapids is to acquire a site and construct a building thereon for postal activities, the present building to be remodeled for other activities. To accomplish this change will require an increase of \$425,000 in the present limit of cost.

#### "ALAMOSA, COLO.

"Limit of cost of \$90,000 contemplates the construction of a building on a site to be donated. Site offered as a donation is not suitable. To carry out this project it is necessary to acquire a site by purchase, which will necessitate an increase in the limit of cost of \$15,000.

#### "DUQUESNE, PA.

"Limit of cost of \$100,000 provided for a building on a site to be donated. Site offered by the city is an interior plot of insufficient frontage. This location is suitable and the purchase of the adjacent corner property will make it a very satisfactory site. To proceed with this project, it will be necessary to increase the present limit of cost by \$45,000.

#### "HIBBING, MINN.

"Limit of cost, \$135,000. A site has been selected but title to same can not be accepted because of reservations to mine coal and other minerals. In order to proceed with this project, it is necessary that legislation permitting the Secretary of the Treasury to accept title subject to such reservations be enacted.

#### "RENO, NEV.

"Legislation contemplates a site and building. A part of the site selected is subject to easements for the maintenance, repair, and replacement of a sewer and an irrigation ditch extending across the entire site. In order to acquire all the land comprising the site, it is necessary that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to accept title to a certain portion of the site subject to easement.

#### "CALUMET, MICH.

"Legislation contemplates acquisition of a site and the construction of a building under a total limit of cost of \$120,000. Site selected by Treasury and Post Office agents is the location of the present leased postal quarters, the entire site, building, and equipment being offered to the Government for \$19,000. The purchase of this property, refacing and remodeling of the building, is estimated to cost \$45,000. No action can be taken toward this purchase until present legislation is amended.



"JACKSON, MISS.

"Project at this place temporarily held pending disposition of a bill permitting the use of the present site in conjunction with property already purchased.

"SAN DIEGO, CALIF.

"Limit of cost for project is insufficient to permit of the purchase of a site favored by Treasury and Post Office Departments. An increase of \$70,000 in the limit of cost would permit the acquisition of this first choice.

"CINCINNATI, OHIO

"Limit of cost of \$1,000,000 for a site is not sufficient to acquire a site in the immediate business area. Unless this amount is increased, it will be necessary to purchase a site on the edge of business and maintain a small postal station in the business section.

"WACO, TEX.

"Present legislation authorizes acquisition of a new site under a limit of cost of \$150,000. Post Office Department considers the present site a better location for its activities than any of the new sites offered. In order to acquire sufficient land to make the present site suitable in area it is necessary that present legislation be amended.

"POTTSVILLE, PA.

"Legislation contemplates the acquisition of a new site and the construction of a new building under a limit of cost of \$325,000. The shape and topography of the sites offered has caused the Post Office Department to recommend the acquisition of additional land, demolition of the present building, and a new building on the present site extended under a limit of cost of \$315,000. Until amended legislation is obtained, no action can be taken toward carrying out the scheme approved by the Post Office Department.

"SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

"Limit of cost for additional land and extension \$1,315,000. The driveway at the rear of the present building is 26 feet wide on one street and 48 feet on the other. Additional land permitting the widening of the driveway can be purchased for \$48,000, although originally held for \$80,000. Had the present limit of cost been sufficient, this additional property would have been purchased. In order to acquire this land an increase of \$48,000 would be necessary.

"There are several other projects which are being temporarily held on account of site complications and no definite statement can be made at this time as to whether or not these cases will ultimately require amended legislation.

"ST. LOUIS, MO.

"Limit of cost \$3,825,000. Federal activities have increased their space requirements 48 per cent since the limit of cost was established. To provide this additional space will necessitate an increase in the limit of cost of \$1,245,000. In the absence of amended legislation, the department proposes to construct a 6-story building so designed that four additional stories may be added at some future date."

The CHAIRMAN. Take the situation at St. Louis, for instance. I understood you to say that it was first contemplated to put up a 6-story building and ultimately to add four more. Is it the purpose now, and is that what is causing the delay, to arrange for the erection of the whole 10 stories?

Mr. MARTIN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is it that is causing the delay?

Mr. MARTIN. The delay up to this time was caused by the courts demanding top-floor or top-building space.

Mr. WETMORE. To get away from the noise.

Mr. MARTIN. Obviously in a 6-story building they would have to be pretty close to the ground, probably on the third, fourth, and fifth floors. The courts were loath to approve a plan of a smaller building, because they were looking forward eventually to a 10-story building and they did not want to be tied down to the third, fourth, and fifth floors when they wanted, say, the seventh, eighth, and ninth floors. But finally, in order to get the job started, a number of conferences were held with the judges and the Department of Justice and the architect and the Treasury officials and we finally reached an agreement as to space assignments and we will have the foundations on the market within a short time. The foundations will be so designed that we can add additional stories at some later date and the design of itself will be such that architecturally it will be a proper building when the final four stories are added.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it is not the intention to hold that up altogether?

Mr. MARTIN. It is not the intention to hold up on that building or on any building where we can go as far as possible under the authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. That applies to St. Paul, also?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any idea when you will start that building in St. Louis or be in a position to start it?

Mr. MARTIN. I think the foundation plans are getting very close to the market now, are they not, Judge Wetmore?

Mr. WETMORE. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. And the same thing is true of St. Paul.

The CHAIRMAN. After your foundation plans are ready, what will be necessary?

Mr. MARTIN. Then you will put the superstructure job on the market for the 6-story building, the smaller building, within the limit of cost.

Mr. WOOD. How soon after the foundation is in?

Mr. MARTIN. The superstructure job ought to be on the market a couple of months before the foundations are completed in order that the construction may be continuous.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us about when you think the foundation will be completed?

Mr. MARTIN. The present indications are that the foundations should be completed about October 1, 1932.

Mr. ARNOLD. How long do you think it will be before these other four stories will be necessary?

Mr. MARTIN. They are necessary right now.

Mr. ARNOLD. What would be the additional cost if you completed your six stories, then stopped, and then at a later date added four stories, over what it would be if you went right ahead and built your 10-story building in one operation?

Mr. MARTIN. I would say that if the judges are agreeable to stay on the third, fourth, and fifth floors, the estimated additional cost would be in the neighborhood of \$100,000 by doing it in two bites.

The CHAIRMAN. That is over and above the actual cost?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir. The judges demand being on the top floor when the other four stories are completed, the cost of remodeling the judges' quarters down below, in addition to the roof changes, and what not, will run a considerable sum above that.

The CHAIRMAN. It would seem to me, inasmuch as these 19 buildings have already been authorized by Congress and already acted upon, they are in a rather different category than new buildings.

Mr. MARTIN. There is no question about that.

Mr. WOOD. Why would it not be more economical to wait a little while and get an authorization to erect your 10 stories at one time? If, as you say, they need the space now, it is only a question of a very short time until you will have to put up the additional four stories, and it seems to me that would be a very uneconomical way of doing it.

Mr. THATCHER. You ought to do one of two things, either defer building this structure altogether until you are ready to go ahead with all of it, or else erect all of it at this time.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. If this is erected now as a 10-story building, what will be the value of the release from other property?

Mr. MARTIN. The post office and courthouse in St. Louis, which it is proposed to vacate, is estimated to be worth in the neighborhood of four to four and a half million dollars, and that building would either be vacated and the activities that could not be placed in the smaller new building would have to rent quarters, or you would have to retain the present post office and courthouse.

Mr. THATCHER. Would there be any market for that old site now?

Mr. MARTIN. You see, in any event, we are thinking about the market about two years from now.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, you are going to use the building up to that time.

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. What is the cost of the St. Louis building as it is proposed to complete it in 10 stories?

Mr. MARTIN. The total limit of cost for site and building is \$3,825,000. We have approximately \$2,700,000 available for construction.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Could you build it within that estimate?

Mr. MARTIN. We can build a 6-story building within the \$2,700,000.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How much would it cost you to build the 10-story building?

Mr. MARTIN. It is estimated that it would cost \$1,245,000 more.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I can not see why you should not go along and finish it at this time.

Mr. THATCHER. The six stories will be inadequate to house all the Federal activities?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir; by some 100,000 square feet.

Mr. THATCHER. Representing a rental of about how much?

Mr. MARTIN. That would be hard to state, Mr. Congressman. At a dollar a foot it would be \$100,000.

Mr. THATCHER. Annually?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THATCHER. If you erected your 10-story building, then you could house all the Federal activities.

Mr. MARTIN. All the Federal activities requiring space at this location and dispose of the old building.

Mr. THATCHER. About how much would it cost to do that; \$1,500,000 more, you say?

Mr. MARTIN. \$1,245,000 is the estimate.

Mr. WOOD. What stands in the way of erecting your 10-story building?

Mr. THATCHER. A Budget estimate.

Mr. WOOD. But if you get an authorization, that will remove the obstacle and I should think it would be worth while to get that and save the amount of money that you have indicated it would cost to do it as it is now proposed.

Mr. ABERNETHY. These 19 projects you are now discussing would come in under the sixth installment. What is the total amount of those 19 projects?

Mr. MARTIN. The increases in limits of cost of all of the 19 will be less than \$5,000,000 and a number of them would not involve any increase in limit of cost.



Mr. ARNOLD. I should think the thing to do would be to hold up the contract on this general construction of these projects until the sixth installment comes along and do now what you know you will have to do eventually at a very much increased cost.

Is it not true that building costs are at a minimum now?

Mr. WETMORE. Yes; the costs are as low as they have been at any time since the war, I think.

Mr. MARTIN. We have contractors coming in and asking us to please take early action on the awarding of contracts because they want to hold their subcontractors to present prices. Several contractors have brought that to my attention.

Mr. ARNOLD. Inasmuch as this space is absolutely needed it would seem to me the proper thing to do would be to go ahead and do the whole job at this time.

Mr. MARTIN. We think so; yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. If that is all there is standing in the way, an authorization for an additional appropriation, it strikes me, from all the facts you have given us, it would be the part of folly to put up a 6-story building and then wait until you get an authorization for another building, repair the roof or change the roof and then put on your additional face. It seems to me that would be a foolish piece of business.

#### STATEMENT OF ST. LOUIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The St. Louis Chamber of Commerce is publicly on record for governmental economy. It will maintain that position by refusing to be a party to any attempt to increase Federal appropriations or expenditures for any project, unless definite economies can be shown as the result of the proposed outlay of Federal funds.

In line with this general policy, we believe, here is a case of "false economy" in which to "pinch" is to pay greater in some other more concealed fashion, a case where it's just as good business to spend in order to save, where such expenditure can be almost covered through the sale of assets already owned by the United States Government in this city, and not a large out-of-Treasury expense, a case where spending now will save considerable money because of present low building costs.

These chief reasons justify and compel the submission of this statement.

#### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

There is now before the Bureau of the Budget the question of an additional authorization for a Federal office building in St. Louis. No money is asked nor will be needed until 1934 or 1935. Two plans have been advanced.

The first is for a 5-story building. An appropriation of \$3,825,000 has been made to buy the ground and erect a building in which to house the offices, departments, agencies, and bureaus now quartered in the present Federal building and the old customhouse. The value of the ground has been fixed at \$1,060,000; the preliminary expenses for plans, deeds, etc., have been estimated at \$190,000, leaving approximately \$2,575,000 for the cost of a building, with 181,500 square feet of floor space.

The second is for a 10-story building. An additional authorization of \$1,250,000 is needed for the erection of a larger building adequate to house not only the bureaus, agencies, and departments located in the present two old buildings, but also a number of other Federal agencies now quartered elsewhere and for which the Government is paying a large annual rental. This plan also contemplates sufficient space for the expansion of existing agencies, as well as for new departments as they may be hereafter created.

Because of the present condition of the Federal Budget, there is some apprehension that the smaller-building idea might prevail. Therefore a thorough study has been made of all the factors involved.

We are submitting certain facts pertinent to the case and contending for the additional authorization primarily for reasons of economy.

#### ECONOMIC REASONS

The United States Government now owns three pieces of property in St. Louis which are an important factor in the present discussion of a new Federal building, i. e., (1) the old Federal building, Eighth and Olive Streets; (2) the old customs building, Third and Olive Streets; (3) a lot on the southeast corner of Fourth and Chestnut Streets.

The old Federal building at Eighth and Olive Streets was erected by the Treasury Department in 1874—58 years ago. Even though construction and land valuation at that time were low, the total cost was \$5,686,854.68, of which \$368,882.65 was paid for the site. Its total floor area totals 163,891 square feet.

In it at the present time are housed: Central post-office station, district court and clerk, court of appeals and clerk, district attorney and Department of Justice, marshal, grand jury, commissioner, customs collector, internal-revenue office, secret-service agents, Naturalization Bureau, Immigration Bureau, narcotic agents, prohibition agents, Engineer Corps, Bureau of Animal Industry, and veterans' employment bureau.

Three qualified appraisers have placed a sale value of \$4,849,560 on this building.

The old Customs Building, located at Third and Olive Streets, has 51,893 square feet of floor area, and in it are now housed: Customs appraiser, food and drug administrators, locomotive inspection, Veterans' Bureau examiner, Civil Service Commission, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard recruiting, Lighthouse Service and Steamboat Inspection, special prohibition agents, One hundred

and second division of the Organized Army Reserve, fruit and vegetable inspectors, Market News Service, and the Interstate Commerce Commission's valuation service.

The sale valuation placed on this property by the appraisers is \$48,195.

The lot at Fourth and Chestnut was purchased by the Government on June 27, 1911, as a site for a new Federal building, following the complaints of officials, merchants, and manufacturers that the then existing quarters were inadequate because departments and agencies were increasing and the then existing ones expanding. At that time Congress appropriated \$1,600,000 to erect a building on this site, but it was never built.

The sale value of this property, according to the appraisers, is \$180,808.80.

Thus the sale values of these three Federal Government-owned pieces of property totals \$5,078,563, while the floor space of the two existing buildings totals 215,784 square feet.

Then came the World War in 1917, which probably doubled the number of agencies, materially increased the number of officials and assistants, as well as the volume of work to be done. A study of the situation following the war showed that the ground area at Fourth and Chestnut was inadequate, and the appropriation too small for the erecting of a building large enough to accommodate the then existing Federal agencies and bureaus, so the Treasury Department selected a new site at the southeast corner of Twelfth Boulevard and Market Street.

An investigation made by the Federal Business Association of St. Louis, an organization composed of the heads of departments, bureaus, and agencies of the United States Government stationed in St. Louis, revealed that a sizable number of Federal agencies in this city were not headquartered in the old Federal building or the old customhouse, and that provisions for these activities were not included in the plans for the proposed new structure on Twelfth Boulevard and Market Street.

Furthermore, it was found that the rental for the space occupied by them amounts to a considerable annual outlay of Federal money. A list of these agencies, their location, floor space occupied, and annual rental follows:

Agency	Location	Square feet	Annual rent
Veterans' Bureau	4030 Chouteau Avenue	19,280	\$26,028
Engineer Corps	Victoria Building	11,589	17,383
Prohibition laboratory	1126 Title Guaranty	2,367	4,303
Bureau of Investigation	Title Guaranty Building	1,900	3,814
Weather Bureau	Railway Exchange Building	1,858	3,600
Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce	Mississippi Valley Transportation	1,652	3,180
National-bank examiners	Federal Commerce Transportation Building	1,500	3,060
Federal grain supervision	Merchants Exchange	2,600	2,907
Bureau of accounts, Interstate Commerce Commission	1721 Railway Exchange Building	1,000	2,160
Ordnance Office	Telephone Building	240	720
Total		43,986	67,160

The Government, therefore, in addition to maintaining the old Federal building and old customhouse, pays \$67,160 annually in rentals for an additional 43,986 square feet of space.

Thus the total floor space the Government now has in St. Louis for the agencies so far mentioned is 259,870 square feet (including the old Federal building space, customhouse, and that which is now rented).

#### SUMMARY

1. The 5-story plan for the new Federal building, if carried through, would provide only 181,500 square feet of floor space.

But the present floor space in the two existing old buildings is 215,784 square feet, to which must be added, to determine the space now in use, the 43,986 square feet rented by the Government, or a total of 259,870 square feet.

Manifestly, therefore, the floor space contemplated in the 5-story plan is wholly inadequate, not only to house existing Federal agencies, but also to provide for their future expansion and to house any new departments, bureaus, or agencies which may be created in the future.

2. Present rent (\$67,160) for space occupied outside of the two existing buildings is large enough of itself, but if carried over a period of years the amount becomes a serious consideration. Furthermore, unless adequate space is provided, any new agencies created, or any expansion of existing departments will swell the rental bill. This could be saved by the erection of the larger building. In these hectic days a dollar saved is a dollar earned.

3. The real estate now owned by the United States Government—the old Federal building, the old customhouse, and the lot at Fourth and Chestnut Streets—when sold will almost equal the cost of erecting the new 10-story office building. So the Government would in reality be paying a comparatively small extra sum for doing the job right.

4. Present building costs are low, perhaps lower than they will again be for years to come. It would be economy to build the large building now rather than wait until later and be penalized with higher costs.

It is therefore obviously good business to build the 10-story building rather than the smaller one for reasons of economy, and in order to provide an edifice where all present Government offices



can be housed and new agencies and the expansion of present ones can be properly cared for.

#### VALUE OF CENTRALIZATION

Central headquarters are a public convenience. When important activities move from place to place every few years, as renters are bound to do, confusion results and irritation develops. Local business constantly utilizes the facilities of Federal agencies. Only loss of time and money follows when one has to move from office to office, located widely apart, to transact business.

But with all offices established in one building, that fact soon becomes fixed in the public mind, stimulates increased use of their services, and establishes a beaten path between business houses and Government offices.

#### ST. LOUIS, PAST AND PRESENT

Fifty-eight years ago, when the old Federal building at Eighth and Olive was erected, the population of St. Louis was 310,864. There was practically no suburban population.

The picture to-day is quite different. In 1930 the population, as given by the United States Census Bureau, was 821,960, with a suburban population of 211,593, while the metropolitan area—which didn't exist in 1874—contains 1,293,516 people within its confines.

The Federal operating bureaus in 1874 were fewer and their duties relatively less, because the volume of business was not to-day's equivalent by hundreds of millions of dollars annually. There was, therefore, proportionately a lesser need for Government service and supervision.

Business in this district has increased even at a larger rate than the population, because the area has become one of the industrial centers of the country. St. Louis, city and suburban, will continue to grow, and with it the need for the expansion of existing Federal agencies and the location of the headquarters of new ones as created.

#### ADDITIONAL REASONS FOR A 10-STORY BUILDING

##### The site:

St. Louis voted an \$87,000,000 bond issue for public improvements. One item in the issue provides for a memorial plaza, with plans for a group of buildings which, from the standpoint of architectural beauty, will be symbolic of the progress and greatness of the city.

All of these structures have been, or will be, erected from public funds raised through taxation. Millions of dollars have been and additional millions will be invested in them. Here will be transacted the business of the municipality.

The site of the proposed Federal office building, at Twelfth Boulevard and Market Street, was selected so that when completed the structure will front on this memorial plaza. Twelfth Boulevard and Market Street is the junction of two of the most traveled boulevards under a system of improved boulevards and streets prepared by the City Plan Commission.

The ends of Twelfth Boulevard, running north and south, verge to the southwest and the northwest. The central and south divisions of this widened thoroughfare have been completed, while the northern has been condemned, and the work of widening is now in process.

Market Street is being similarly widened, and commissioners have assessed the damages and benefits for the necessary right of way for widening, and by the time the Federal building is completed this street likewise will be finished. This boulevard will connect with the proposed improved Mississippi River waterfront and will join the boulevards and parkways extending along the river with the commercial and financial districts in the heart of the city and the residential sections.

Like the northern and southern extensions of Twelfth Boulevard, Market Street will connect with the State and Federal highway leading to the West, the Northwest, and the Southwest, as well as to the North and South. It likewise has direct connection with the bridges across the Mississippi River, and thereby connects directly with the Federal highways converging at St. Louis from all sections east of the river.

As a matter of fact, the Memorial Plaza, on which the proposed Federal building will be located, is the focal point of extensive city planning, on which St. Louis has already spent millions of dollars, and the work is only well in hand. A building which houses the offices of the United States Government should harmonize in monumental importance with the plans of the municipality.

#### CHARACTER OF BUILDINGS ON PLAZA

The type of buildings, public and private, erected on the Memorial Plaza, or immediately adjacent thereto, is a factor which should not be overlooked.

North of the new Federal building, across Market Street, is the new Civil Courts Building, which, when finally completed, will cost about \$5,000,000. The City Hall, immediately west, across Twelfth Boulevard, was finished years ago, before the period of high construction costs, at \$2,000,000. On the north side of the plaza is the Public Library, erected 20 years ago, for \$1,500,000. On the south side of the plaza is the Municipal Courts Building, costing \$2,083,000 for ground and building. A block south of the plaza on Twelfth Boulevard is the Police Administration Building and Gymnasium, costing \$2,165,519. Northeast of the Civil Courts Building is the \$6,000,000 Telephone Office Building, and across the street from the Public Library and facing the plaza is the \$4,000,000 Missouri Pacific Building.

The Government of the United States, with an outstanding location in such a group, should not erect a building inferior in size, design, or needs to those erected by the city. If for no other reason, although there are others, national officials should not invite invidious comparisons that will follow failure to erect an edifice commensurate to its purpose and surroundings.

But that viewpoint is based on a consciousness that the dignity of the Federal Government, when erecting a building where its various officials in charge of local and district affairs will be housed, shall not permit its quarters to appear secondary to those of a municipal corporation.

#### CONCLUSION

The St. Louis Chamber of Commerce urges approval of an additional authorization now, large enough to enable the erection of a new 10-story Federal office building in St. Louis.

(1) Because it will save the Government \$67,160 annually in rentals, plus the cost of maintaining the present two old buildings, to say nothing of increased rentals which may become necessary due to enlargement of present activities or the creation of new departments.

(2) Because it will adequately house all existing Federal agencies, bureaus, and departments in St. Louis, and take care of their future expansion and that of any new agencies created.

(3) Because the property now owned by the United States Government can be sold for an amount almost equal to the cost of erecting the new 10-story building.

(4) Because now is the time to build right as building costs are low.

(5) Because of the convenience of centralized location for business users of governmental facilities.

(6) Because the United States Government certainly should erect a structure in harmony with other buildings surrounding it, both in size and architectural beauty, so that invidious comparisons can not follow, and in order that its quarters may not be secondary to those of municipal corporations.

Respectfully submitted.

ST. LOUIS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
C. W. GAYLORD,

*Chairman of the Board.*

St. Louis, Mo., February 23, 1932.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I did not rise to make a defense for Mr. Mellon nor to make any attack upon him. I have never seen the old gentleman but a few times in my life. The other gentleman who was mentioned this afternoon, Mr. Wetmore, the Supervising Architect, and for whom my friend, who happens to be a thirty-second degree brother, made an honorable defense, I happen to know myself. I was glad he did make that defense for him, because I happen to have that honor, the thirty-second degree, myself, and if he had not done it I would.

It has been my pleasure a few times to have visited Mr. Wetmore, the Supervising Architect, with reference to business connected with his office. I want to say for him, whether he is an architect or not, he has more knowledge of the architectural work going on by this Government in the United States than any man in it. There is not a job that you can inquire about but what this Supervising Architect is perfectly familiar with it and can give you any information you desire with reference to it.

I had the privilege of conferring with him not more than a week ago with reference to a matter, and I soon found out that he knew more about what I was inquiring about than I did, and it was in my own locality. I think he is the right man in the right place.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not what I wanted this five minutes for. My good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], has had his grievance against Mr. Mellon, and presumably the attack that he made this afternoon on the article of aluminum was leveled against Mr. Mellon. It happens that the great bauxite mines of America, next to the largest one in the world, I presume, are located in my district, in the county adjoining the county where I have lived all of my life. I have lived within 25 miles of those mines for my entire life. Aluminum is made from that article, and, as some gentleman said this evening, you will find that were now in every 10-cent store in America. What I want to say is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] ought not to reflect against a great ware of that kind when it is used in the construction of buildings and mined in Arkansas. I want some aluminum used in Federal



buildings, because it is produced down in Hot Springs County, Ark. [Laughter and applause.] It is the finest polished metal to be had. It is as cheap as anything to be had. It is cheaper than brass or some of those things that they want to use as a substitute. Somebody might have a prejudice against it, but not justly so. The bauxite mines in my district employ from 1,000 to 1,500 men all the time.

On this lead of bauxite there has recently been discovered, within 6 miles of where I live, some tripoli mines that will be developed soon, that enter into the making of Dutch Cleanser polish and other polishes for ware and which also enters into automobile tires and such things as that. That is right in connection with it, and it all is found right down in Hot Springs County, Ark., where I live. [Applause.] I am proud of it.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. You have a diamond mine down there too?

Mr. GLOVER. We have a diamond mine there, too, the only one in the world. Arkansas is no longer called the "hoozier" State, but is called the "diamond" State. You can go down there and get your diamonds. You can go down there and get your baths. The truth of the matter is that down there you can get almost anything you want, if you want something dry. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition for five minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gravamen of the complaint of the gentleman from Texas is that, in certain specifications of the Treasury Department for public buildings, aluminum in some form or other is required in the material furnished, either in the frames or in the furnishings. I listened attentively to the address of the gentleman, and noted the interpolation of the gentleman from New York as to the use of aluminum in the Empire State Building. The membership would have been led to believe that aluminum was not in use in the construction of large buildings, but that the Treasury Department was attempting to force aluminum as a material in the construction.

If the gentleman from Texas had been fortunate in his peregrinations about the country in advocacy of the bonus to have had the time, as for example, on his visit to my home city in Milwaukee during the Christmas holidays, to have gone to the plant of the A. O. Smith Co., which Arthur Brisbane describes, in the method of producing pipes and chassis for automobiles, to be the ninth wonder of the world, he would have seen there a most modern office building, erected by the A. O. Smith Co., 12 stories of construction, entirely faced with aluminum. That was finished more than two years ago.

It has been stated to the gentleman that the Empire State Building, constructed under the direction of that great leader of Democracy, Alfred E. Smith, also has aluminum prescribed as its finishings. Does the gentleman contend that the Treasury Department should hold back in the pace of progress and refuse to recognize the value of aluminum with its intrinsic merits as a necessary building material?

Why not be fair? Why does he not call the attention of the country to the fact that aluminum is now being generally accepted as the finest type of material in office construction? The gentleman is only telling a half truth, and a very small half truth at that, when he reads from the architects' magazine which is limited entirely to public buildings. Why did not the gentleman go further and investigate architects' publications as to private buildings? If he had done that he would have found, I dare say, numerous instances where aluminum is to-day the accepted article for outside finish?

I think the gentleman owes an apology to this House for only giving half truths in trying to show that Mr. Mellon used the high privileges of his office, through the Supervising Architect, in prescribing aluminum as a necessary material for public-building construction?

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly.

Mr. PATMAN. In prescribing aluminum, does not the gentleman think the Secretary of the Treasury should also give wood and steel a chance?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not living in the age of 100 or 200 years ago. We must move forward; and I know this much about fixtures, that when the building in which I have my office was remodeled it was provided, so as to keep out dust, that aluminum weather strips be used. I know that much. I am very sorry indeed the gentleman did not have time to visit our breweries on his visit to Milwaukee so that he might have gotten some liberal ideas, and also that the gentleman did not have time to visit the A. O. Smith plant in order to get modern ideas as to modern construction. We are all modern in Milwaukee.

I hope the gentleman, who has so often said he reflects the ideas of the war veterans, will go to the desk and sign the petition for the discharge of the Judiciary Committee in the matter of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, because then he will surely be carrying out the will and wishes of the war veterans of the World War. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pro forma motion I made to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to withdraw his pro forma motion to strike out the paragraph. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 35, after line 10, insert:

"New Orleans, La., post office and courthouse: For acoustical treatment in the court room, \$2,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the amendment I have offered simply provides that \$2,000 be made available for acoustical treatment in the Federal court room in the city of New Orleans. Unless this amendment prevails the judges and counsel will be forced to continue the practice of shouting above the whine of traffic that passes on Camp Street. There are three Federal court rooms on the second floor of the post office building. The central room is used by United States Judge Wayne G. Borah, and the court room on the Magazine Street side is used by the Fifth United States Circuit Court of Appeals. The third room, on the Camp Street side, is used only in emergencies on account of the lack of acoustical treatment.

It is impossible, gentlemen of the committee, for counsel or witnesses to hear what is going on in the court room under the conditions which prevail there to-day. I submit to the committee that is not decorum and is not in keeping with the dignity of a United States court.

Let me call the attention of the committee to page 625 of the hearing:

#### ACOUSTICAL TREATMENT, NEW ORLEANS (LA.) COURTHOUSE

The CHAIRMAN. There is an item here in reference to the New Orleans post office and courthouse, for acoustical treatment in the court room, \$2,000. Tell us about that.

Mr. WETMORE. I want to say, in the first place, that our maintenance appropriation "for repairs and preservation" are not permitted by the comptroller to be used for acoustical treatment in public buildings. The appropriation is in terms for repairs and preservation, and we would have money enough to do this work out of our annual appropriation, if the comptroller would allow us. But he holds, and I suppose properly, that this character of expenditure is neither a repair nor a preservation. It is in the nature of an improvement, and he draws the line on us there.

The district engineer, Mr. Richly, stated:

"This room has been but little used on account of this trouble (that is, the acoustical defects), but since two additional judges have been appointed it will be necessary to use all the court rooms. I have conferred with several of the judges and recommended that consideration be given to the correction of the acoustics as requested, and which are very bad."



Further, in the hearings there is a letter from Judge Bryan addressed to the custodian of the building, complaining about the same situation.

The committee to-day cut out about three positions down in New Orleans, amounting to thousands of dollars, and I think at least the committee can be charitable enough to give New Orleans this \$2,000 so as to repair the acoustics of this court room, which, as I have said, is something that is badly needed.

Certainly, it is not in keeping with the dignity of a Federal court to have witnesses crowding around the attorneys' tables and around the judge's stand to hear what is going on.

I hope the committee will restore this item to the bill.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like very much indeed to agree to the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman has made a very earnest effort to have it included in the bill and it was a part of the Budget estimate. The reason it is omitted from the bill is because the committee felt it is one of those expenditures that can easily be deferred for another year. We eliminated many expenditures on this ground.

For years they have not had this improvement down there in New Orleans, and they have been getting along pretty well, and it seems to me on account of the present situation of the Treasury, we might well defer it for one more year at least.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I might call the gentleman's attention to the fact that they have not been using this particular court room that they have to use now. The fact they recently appointed two additional judges down there has made it necessary that they should use this additional court room. It is a small matter and I sincerely hope the committee will agree to the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS. It is a small sum, but I will say to the gentleman that consistent with the policy of the committee with reference to other appropriations, this being in our opinion not an absolutely essential appropriation, we eliminated it, and I think in order to be fair the committee must insist that the amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FERNANDEZ) there were—ayes 4, noes 14.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in the authorization of funds for public buildings there was authorized an appropriation of \$580,000,000 as a total, out of which the District of Columbia was allotted \$150,000,000.

I want to show you what is happening. The department committee went ahead and made its allocation with respect to the smaller towns, but the Bureau of the Budget has refused to pass it up to Congress, and the thing which I predicted would happen when the large cities and the District of Columbia received their money to build their buildings, the smaller cities would be left out. I stated at that time that the small towns throughout the United States would be shut out, and that is what has happened already.

The District of Columbia was to get \$150,000,000 and \$40,000,000 more for land, or \$190,000,000 out of a total of \$580,000,000. The District of Columbia has already received over \$100,000,000, and to the credit of the Committee on Appropriations it may be said that they cut them down to \$15,000,000 in this bill; but the Bureau of the Budget was willing to give more money for the District of Columbia and yet refused appropriations for the buildings that will take them now 6 or 7 or 8 years to finish, and they are the buildings that are needed in the smaller cities all over the United States.

As soon as they get the buildings in the District of Columbia and in the large cities of the country, then the smaller cities of the country can go. They are through with them.

This is not the fault of the Treasury Department nor the Post Office Department, but it is the fault of the Bureau of the Budget. After having granted \$100,000,000 to the District of Columbia and \$40,000,000 to buy land in the District of Columbia, they then refused to ask Congress to appropriate the money for buildings in the small cities, amounting to something like \$154,000,000.

I am here to protest and to serve notice on the Bureau of the Budget and the committee, that if they expect large appropriations to the District of Columbia they are going to go through with the allocations made to the small cities, or we will see the reason why.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read to the bottom of page 35.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOWARD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 9699, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### THE CONGRESS OF NICARAGUA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MANAGUA, NICARAGUA, VIA TROPICAL RADIO,  
New Orleans, La., February 23, 1932.

SECRETARIES OF THE FEDERAL CONGRESS,  
Washington, D. C.

The Congress of Nicaragua congratulates the Congress of the United States of North America and the dignified American people on the occasion of the National Bicentennial of the great General Washington whose name and glorious actions are intimately bound with the institutions of the American Republic.

L. RAMIREZ, President.

PABLO J. JIMINEZ, Secretary.

ALEJANDRO ASTACIO, Secretary.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF CRIMINAL LAW—BANKRUPTCY (H. DOC. NO. 262)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered printed.

(For text of message of the President see Senate proceedings, p. 4920.)

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GILLEN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for six days, on account of important business.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech by my colleague, Hon. WILLIAM E. HULL, before the American Legion Post, No. 2, Peoria, Ill., on February 18, 1932.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

#### SPEECH OF HON. WILLIAM E. HULL, OF ILLINOIS

Honorable Commander and members of Peoria Post, No. 2: It was with a special pleasure that I received your kind invitation to be your guest to-night and to speak to you briefly upon matters of national importance.

Recently I have received numerous letters from the American Legion posts throughout the district and the Nation urging me to stand for a liberal policy toward national defense, and I want to say to-night that I stand before you, as I have always stood, a firm believer of the principle of maintaining defense adequate to assure the peace and tranquillity of our Nation.

Great strides are being made in scientific achievements toward perfection of instruments of destruction to be used in war, and no nation can sit calmly by and ignore the preparations made by the scientists of other Nations and not take some step toward meeting them.

The time has not yet come, in my opinion, when the lion and lamb can lie down in safety together. Nations are still jealous of each other; and while this condition exists the United States should have at least a nucleus of an Army, trained to the last minute in all modern methods of warfare, and our young men



should have an opportunity to at least have some slight vision of the training that is necessary for them to have in order to protect themselves if called upon to defend their country.

We should have a navy efficient and capable to at least match the navy of any other country in the world. That is the only sure way that I know of to enable us to keep our peace and integrity among the nations.

Our country was born in battle. When the Colonies, in 1775, rebelled against the mother country, it was in defense of the principle taxation without representation was tyranny, and they simply were fighting for equal rights as citizens of England; but, as the struggle continued, the great colonial leaders had a vision. It came to them that this was the day that men had looked forward to for thousands of years, and they came to the decision that they would at once and for all strike for the great principle that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and when George Washington received the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, a new nation was born, and for the first time in the world's history there was a flag under whose folds was guaranteed to its citizens equal rights and equal justice.

George Washington, the great Commander in Chief of the victorious Continental Armies, became our first President, and under his matchless wisdom the United States took its place among the nations of the world and hoped for years of peace and tranquillity but it was not long before it became necessary to declare war against England in order to protect the rights of our American seamen, who were being impressed into service on British ships.

This War of 1812 gave birth to the American Navy and was practically won upon the high seas in a naval campaign that challenged the admiration of the world, the war being brought to a sudden close by the spectacular victory of Andrew Jackson and his straight-shooting mountaineers at the Battle of New Orleans.

In 1846 it became necessary to declare war upon Mexico in order to protect our southwestern boundary and settle the boundary dispute between the two countries, and as a result of the victory of Zachary Taylor at Buena Vista the boundary line between the two countries was definitely settled for all time to come.

In 1861, the great crisis of American history appeared. After many years of heated controversy and debate, the time had come to settle forever whether a government such as ours could maintain its integrity, half free and half slave.

In this great crisis, God gave us Lincoln.

Four years of frightful struggle ensued and when General Grant received the sword of Lee at Appomattox, it was determined beyond a peradventure of a doubt that this country of the people, by the people, for the people, should not perish from the earth.

In 1898, it became necessary to declare war against the Kingdom of Spain, not only to maintain our national integrity, but in order to rescue the citizens of our next-door neighbor, Cuba, who were being ground into the dust under the tyranny of the iron heel of Spain. When Teddy Roosevelt planted the Stars and Stripes on the San Juan Hill and the smoke of battle had cleared from the decks of Dewey's fleets in Manila Bay, freedom took another breath of life, and tyranny, such as was practiced in the islands of Cuba and the Philippines, disappeared from the face of the earth.

Then came the World War, and I bow my head with reverence and respect before you men who, by your heroic deeds, wrote so clearly the final chapters of that great conflict. No one can ever know, as well as you, the sacrifices that were made, the hardships that were endured in order to bring peace once more to a war-torn world. A greater man than I has told you that when you laid aside your steel-clad helmet, that when you hung up your khaki uniform, you had only performed a part of the responsibilities that were yours to perform. An even greater task lay before you in solving the problems of peace and making the adjustments that were necessary to bring about harmony out of the chaos caused by this great war. These problems confront you on every hand to-day, more serious in some respects than war; and in the solution of these problems, it is my hope that you will be guided by the wisdom of Washington, by the great human kindness of Lincoln, and by the conciliatory methods of the martyred President, McKinley. The drive recently started by the American Legion posts throughout the country to find jobs for a million of the unemployed is a worthy step in this direction; I bid you God-speed in this good work and stand ready at all times to assist you in all your undertakings.

You are all more or less familiar with my activities in Congress in behalf of the veterans of our different wars and especially in behalf of the veterans of the World War, because all the legislation in their behalf took things up at the beginning and consequently had to be original, and many of the plans had to be worked out to meet new conditions. I gave eagerly and willingly all my best thought to the preparation of this legislation and have supported every practical effort that has been made to compensate and reimburse the soldiers of the World War as far as it is humanly and practically possible.

The legislation that was passed could not represent the opinion of any individual but had to reflect the composite thought of the entire Congress.

I was one of those who thought in the beginning that if we were going to pay the veterans an adjusted compensation, we ought to pay it in cash. I have never thought that it was common sense to postpone the payment of this compensation for 20

years because we all knew by that time pension legislation would be enacted to take care of those who were disabled, afflicted, and needed help. I felt that this act of Congress should provide for giving the boys a start after they came back from the war and in some measure to equalize their position with those who were not called to the colors. For this reason I will be glad to see the balance paid on these compensation certificates just as soon as some financial arrangement can be made to take care of them.

I realize that arrangements must be made in the near future, if it is not possible to do it at this time, to take care of the widows and orphans of the veterans of the World War as has been done in regard to the veterans of our other wars.

Economic conditions at the present moment are in a sort of chaotic condition, and these conditions must be taken into consideration. However, I think we should meet this matter in a courageous manner and as soon as it is possible make arrangements to fulfill in a full measure our obligations to these veterans.

During the time that I have served as your Representative in Congress, I have in a careful and painstaking and sympathetic manner handled individual cases for the veterans of the sixteenth district amounting now into the thousands.

The adjustments of these compensation claims are fixed by law; there is no way whereby a Member of Congress can wave a magic wand and cause a compensation claim to be allowed out of hand, but it is possible for a Member of Congress, if he so desires, to render valuable assistance to the soldiers and their dependents by finding out what is necessary in order to perfect a claim and then painstakingly help the soldier to secure the necessary evidence and see that it receives the proper consideration by the bureau official. This, I have tried to do and I take advantage of this opportunity to gratefully acknowledge the assistance that has come to me in this connection from the American Legion posts, not only here in Peoria but throughout the district. No soldier boy or his dependents need ever to hesitate or apologize for writing me in behalf of any matter with which they are concerned, because their communication will find a welcome at my office and it will receive the best attention that it is possible to give it.

I have been given the honor of presenting to you a bust of George Washington, sponsored by the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of this great American, whose great achievements time has not dimmed but have come down through the ages, gathering additional luster through the years. George Washington—the great general but a kind husband, a great statesman but a humble citizen, a man of great achievements but a kind and faithful neighbor! It is exceedingly fitting that his bust should find a place in the lodge room of your post—he was the first American Legionnaire.

#### THE OIL SITUATION IN OHIO

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the oil situation in Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I think most Democrats are getting tired of our tariff position being misrepresented. I noted in the Washington Post for Saturday, February 27, this concluding paragraph in an editorial:

Democrats in the oil-producing States plead with no less vociferation for a duty on petroleum. The "iniquities of the tariff" soon melt away when it is applied to industries of Democratic States. In the face of these organized drives to tax two imports that are now admitted free the howl of the central Democratic organization against the Smoot-Hawley Act sounds like a wind blowing through an empty barrel.

Here is the official statement of our party as set forth in the platform of 1928:

The Democratic tariff legislation will be based on the following policies:

- (a) The maintenance of legitimate business and a high standard of wages for American labor.
- (b) Increasing the purchasing power of wages and income by the reduction of those monopolistic and extortionate tariff rates bestowed in payment of political debts.
- (c) Abolition of logrolling and restoration of the Democratic conception of a fact-finding tariff commission, quasi-judicial and free from the Executive domination which has destroyed the usefulness of the present commission.
- (d) Duties that will permit effective competition, insure against monopoly, and at the same time produce a fair revenue for the support of government. Actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of the American laborer, must be the extreme measure of every tariff rate.
- (e) Safeguarding the public against monopoly created by special tariff favors.
- (f) Equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of the tariff among all.



When the whole Nation is interested in our attempts to restore prosperity there can be little justification for the utterly false charges being continuously leveled against Democratic Members of Congress who are loyally following the principles officially enunciated by our national convention.

It might be interesting to know just why the paper making this attack has been so ardently misrepresenting the Democratic Party and the American petroleum industry. Why should it oppose this tariff only? What sinister or at least concealed motives lie behind its desperate efforts to whitewash the monopoly now being developed by the great oil-importing corporations at the expense of American labor and to the ruin of American prosperity?

This question is purely rhetorical. While you and I may guess the cause of the trouble, we do not know it positively and we can have no reasonable expectation that it will be revealed by those most interested.

The manner in which Ohio is being looted to-day for the benefit of the great oil-importing corporations and to the ruin of our industry and to the destitution of our workers, is suggested by the fact that every barrel of Pennsylvania oil produced in the 17 counties in southeastern Ohio is not only given away, but a \$2 bill is taken out of the producer's pocket and pinned to every barrel sold. Over the rest of the State in the other three fields—Corning, Lima, and Wooster—the producer not only gives his oil away, but pins a \$1 bill to every barrel sold at present prices. These facts are being widely disseminated through my State by the oil companies, who are informing the people concerning the facts underlying the poverty and distress which are the natural result of our free admission of cheap foreign oil produced by cheap foreign labor, while American workers starve.

At present 60 counties in Ohio are oil producing, while the other 28 counties are potential oil fields, according to A. E. Faine, statistician of the Ohio Penn Grade Oil Producers Association, whose carefully compiled statistics I am utilizing in these remarks. The potential territory thus far undeveloped in Ohio will also enter the producing field, with the resulting employment of thousands of men who are now jobless, whenever we give the American petroleum industry an equal chance at our own markets with foreigners whom we are to-day favoring to our ruin. Ohio contains 11 per cent of all the oil wells in the United States. Over one-half of the number of men normally employed in this industry in my State are without employment to-day.

The general discontent naturally produced by this unemployment, which is artificially caused and which could be easily remedied if simple justice were applied to the oil problem, is being capitalized and fomented by those elements which are eager to destroy our political institutions and our economic system. No one need be surprised that men who realize that their poverty has been created and is being continued in order that a few great oil-importing concerns may add a billion dollars or so per year to their profits should question the worth of a system which deliberately continues such a state of affairs.

The State itself is suffering from this situation. Oil production pays a tax rate of 10 per cent throughout the country. Ohio taxes gasoline 110 per cent. The Ohio producer ultimately pays all these taxes by lowered prices for crude oil, which is his product, because of the importation of foreign oil either already admitted or poised as a menace in case the American producer proves refractory.

Oil wells are being abandoned, to the great economic loss of the State. In the past two years 3,179 oil wells have been closed, causing a taxable valuation loss of many millions of dollars per year and a direct tax loss of thousands of dollars, while the loss in wages to employees who formerly operated those wells is a staggering total. Meanwhile, the closing of those wells means the loss forever of millions of barrels of oil, which can never be recovered. Every friend of conservation of our natural resources should note this effect of our unwise and costly policy of admitting foreign oil duty free.

There is no future for the petroleum industry in Ohio, and I see little promise in fact for the industry in other States of the Union if we are to continue the policy of granting such costly favors to a few oil importers or to a comparatively small number of manufacturers who prefer to save a cent or two on fuel oil while they wreck their own potential market in this Nation.

Those who suggest that the American petroleum industry can solve its problem by limiting production can know, if they do not already know, that this industry has involved private agreement, State regulation and even bayonets in order to reduce production well within the limits of demand, only to see the importers of foreign oil increase those imports until they had flooded the market which the American producer had tried to stabilize. This Nation is suffering to-day from overimportation of foreign oil and not from overproduction of American oil. It is suffering from the greed of those who are reckless whether their profits are stained with the tears and the blood of American workers while they continue to employ increasing numbers of peons and alien laborers for the sake of the possible profits.

Judas Iscariot got only 30 pieces of silver for his betrayal; Benedict Arnold got only a major general's rank and pension; but the oil importers are reaping hundreds of millions of dollars per year as the price of wreckage of American prosperity and their favoritism displayed toward foreign lands and foreign flags and foreign labor.

#### REPORT OF THE NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the latest report of the national employment commission, which shows that the total to date is 117,535 men employed. I ask unanimous consent to include a telegram giving the result of the splendid work thus far attained in the State of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

NEW YORK, N. Y., February 29, 1932.

ED HOLLENBACK,

National Chairman Child Welfare,

Assistant to Mark T. McKee, Executive Director:

Nation-wide total to date 117,535. Following Minnesota towns credited men put to work as follows: Albert Lea, 80; Anoka, 5; Benson, 5; Brooten, 11; Cambridge, 37; Cloquet, 75; Columbia Heights, 105; Crookston, 50; Detroit Lake, 7; Duluth, 1,854; Eveleth, 139; Excelsior, 5; Faribault, 39; Fergus Falls, 164; Hanley Falls, 3; International Falls, 17; Isle, 15; Jackson, 9; Lesueur, 178; Marshall, 29; Minneapolis, 744, in addition over \$5,000,000 pledged; Motley, 5; Osseo, 4; Pequot, 5; Perham, 10; Pipestone, 25; Red Wing, 44; Redwood Falls, 15; Robbinsdale, 150; Rochester, 230; Springfield, 4; Stillwater, 50; Tacomite, 65; Truman, 20; Wabasha, 4; Wadena, 24; Waterville, 34; Windom, 11; in addition following money pledges: Fergus Falls, \$80,000; Ortonville, \$8,000; Duluth, almost \$2,000,000.

MILLER.

#### ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a speech delivered by my colleague from New York [Mr. Celler] over the radio on February 12 relating to Abraham Lincoln.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by my colleague, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, over the radio, on February 12, relating to Abraham Lincoln:

#### ADDRESS OF HON. EMANUEL CELLER, OF NEW YORK

Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of the United States, was born February 12, 1809, in a log cabin in the hills of Kentucky.

A half century later, when he had received the nomination for the Presidency, a biographer asked him for some details of his early life. "Why," he said, "it is a great folly to attempt to make anything out of me or my early life. It can all be contained in a single sentence; and that sentence you will find in Gray's Elegy—

"The short and simple annals of the poor."

That's my life and that's all you or anyone else can make of it."

Truly enough his whole life was dedicated to an attempt to rescue the American under dog and to pull the poor and lowly from between the upper and nether stones of oppression.



His life is also typical of American opportunity—the America that has permitted a barefoot boy like Lincoln to rise to the Presidency. During the last presidential election the two men who ran for President and the two men who ran for Vice President in the major parties were also the products of American opportunity. Smith was the son of a blacksmith. Curtis was born in an Indian Kaw village. Robinson and Hoover were farmer boys.

When Lincoln was 7 years of age, his family moved from Kentucky to Indiana and there for 10 years he was engaged in laborious work of all sorts—farming, rail splitting, running errands for shopkeepers. He only had a year's schooling, at intervals, but his love of learning was insatiable. His mother had taught him to read and he chose as his reading the Bible, *Aesop's Fables*, *Pilgrim's Progress*, and *Robinson Crusoe*. Out of these seeds of reading grew the great ardor that Lincoln had for books. He would walk 20 miles to borrow a book and 20 miles to return it.

At the age of 19, while employed on a river boat, he took a cargo down the Mississippi River to New Orleans. There he got his first awful impression of slavery. The scenes he saw at the New Orleans slave market were ineffaceable, and he then vowed to strike a telling blow at this nefarious traffic. He brooded much over slavery, and that brooding culminated in his greatest act of charity and beneficence, the Emancipation Proclamation, which, although only a militia measure put forth during the Civil War, had far-reaching effects and practically broke the shackles of slavery in this country.

He had a fierce love of honesty. They called him Honest Abe. The story is often told of his walking 3 miles to return a few pennies of overcharge.

In 1834 Lincoln was elected a member of the Illinois Legislature. He was reelected several times, and then was licensed to practice law. He was generous by nature. He was always more anxious to win his client's case than to get his client's money.

His skill at law and in the legislature caused him to be nominated for Congress. He was elected and was Representative from the central district of Illinois. His activity in Congress was noteworthy, and he gained a national reputation for his clear-cut speeches denouncing slavery.

It is difficult in a 15-minute address to give any detail of the life of this great man. One can only touch the high spots and mention but a few of the jewels in the diadem of his splendid character.

We often hear much said of Lincoln's kindly humor. It was the humor of the common people. He knew their aims and their aspirations and reflected their views, consequently, in the quiet and plaintive tales he told of them. When he was in the White House he was afflicted with a slight attack of varioloid or smallpox. Speaking of this, he said: "Now that I have something to give, no one wants to take it from me."

In his famous debates with Douglas on the question of slavery, he often used ridicule and humor to wither the Douglas arguments. Douglas once twitted him for having been a dramseller at Springfield. (Lincoln had obtained a license as an inkeeper for the sale of liquor.) Lincoln quickly replied, "When I was a liquor seller at Springfield, you were one of my best customers. I have since relinquished my stand on the one side of the counter, but you have never relinquished your stand on the other."

In an endeavor to squelch a loud and verbose opponent in one of his famous debates, he told of a traveler. The traveler had lost his way, and, as he went along, a storm broke forth, the rain came down in torrents, the sky was split with lightning, and the world seemed to come apart with deafening thunder. He sank deep in mud and mire and could see only the slight traces of his path in the intermittent flashes of lightning. Not being a praying man, he was, nevertheless, forced to his knees by a dreadful clap of thunder and in his praying said, "Dear God, let us have a little more light and a little less noise."

When the Sons of Temperance called upon Lincoln in the White House and indignantly denounced Grant on the score of his heavy drinking, Lincoln, who had great faith in Grant because of his recent victories, said to the dry brethren, "Please let me have the name of the brand of whisky that Grant drinks, as I want to send a barrelful of it to my other generals."

We love Lincoln because of his great humility, his great magnanimity. Salmon P. Chase had been his Secretary of the Treasury. He was a great man and a great Secretary, but he often spoke ill of Lincoln. Lincoln knew that he went around peddling his grief in private ears in an endeavor to sow dissatisfaction with Lincoln; nevertheless when a vacancy occurred in the Supreme Court as a result of the death of Chief Justice Roger Taney, Lincoln, realizing Chase's fitness for the position, and disregarding his personal grievance, gave him the appointment.

While he was President thousands of applications came to him for the exercise of clemency in behalf of soldiers who were doomed to die because of desertion or other offenses. William Scott was a lad from Vermont who, after a tremendous march in the peninsular campaign, volunteered to do double duty to spare a sick comrade. He slept at his post. He was caught and sentenced to death. Lincoln heard of it and visited him and, placing his hands on the boy's shoulders, said, "My boy, you are not going to be shot. I believe you when you tell me that you could not keep awake. I am going to trust you and send you back to the regiment. Now, what I want to know is how are you going to pay my bill?" Scott thought that Lincoln meant how he, Scott, was going to repay him in money, and he said he could give him all his pay. Lincoln said, "My bill is a large one, and the only way

you can repay me is by doing your duty." Scott promised to do his duty. Not long after he was desperately wounded and died, but not before he could send a message to the President that he had tried to be a good soldier; that he had paid his debt in full, and that he had died thinking of Lincoln's kind face and thanking him for the chance he had given him to fall like a true soldier in battle.

Lincoln showed his merciful nature in his attitude toward the vanquished South. Lincoln had desired, if possible, to bring about a gradual abolition of slavery and through local State action. He did not wish, for example, that the right to vote should be given in a wholesale manner to all negroes, the literate and the illiterate. He desired that the franchise at first be restricted to a few educated negroes. In this attitude Lincoln incurred the enmity of the radicals in Congress who claimed he was not sound on slavery.

He desired in all available ways to give the people of the South a chance to express their own wishes at their own elections. He refused to send a group of Northern carpetbaggers to the South and have them elected as Representatives and Senators in Congress from those States. He was afraid lest in the Southern elections to Congress that very thing should happen which after his death did happen, namely, the election of scalawags and carpetbaggers from the North as Representatives from the Southern States, whose elections were secured at the point of Federal bayonets. He wished to declare a general amnesty to all Southerners and wanted to welcome them back to the Union, provided, of course, that they respected the Constitution and all forms of law and order, and on condition, further, that they would respect the rights of the liberalized negroes.

Undoubtedly, had Lincoln escaped the assassin's bullet and lived, he would have met the fate of Andrew Johnson, who succeeded him to the Presidency at his death. Johnson was impeached because he sought to carry out Lincoln's policy of mercy to the South. Lincoln, too, would have been impeached had he lived. A band of fanatical radicals ruled Congress. They were headed by Thaddeus Stevens, of Pennsylvania. They seemed bent upon utterly destroying the South and ushered in the "tragic era" of reconstruction. There is a current play in New York entitled "If Booth Had Missed." It seeks to continue the life of Lincoln as if the bullet John Wilkes Booth fired in Ford's Theater had missed its mark and Lincoln had served out his term. It then goes on to state that his benevolence to the South incurred the extreme hostility of the radicals and they impeached him. The impeachment in the Senate failed of but one vote and then Lincoln was shot by an editor. This, of course, is but the imagination of the playwright; it catches, however, the spirit of liberality of Lincoln's program for Southern reconstruction.

If time would permit, I could tell you of his great addresses, particularly of his Gettysburg address at the dedication of the national cemetery. His remarks there are immortal. Curiously enough, the speech of the occasion was delivered by Edward Everett. Lincoln was to say but a few words at the close of the exercises. Everett's oration lasted two hours. It was a fine specimen of Civil War oratory, which, however, charms no more. Lincoln spoke for a little over five minutes, but his words sank deep. Nevertheless his hearers were unaware that a classic had been spoken which will endure forever in the English language.

All through his life Lincoln suffered much. His whole career seemed to be a struggle against insurmountable odds. His perseverance, however, always ended in victory. Trouble chastened him and made him great. The more severe the storms and the snows and sleet of the winter of the Northwest the finer and harder and more wholesome is the wheat. The more intense the white heat of the flame the more finely tempered becomes the steel. "Sweet are the uses of adversity." Trial and tribulation bent and tempered the mind of Lincoln and made him indeed one of our great immortals.

During the cataclysm of the Civil War, with death and destruction all around him, with his own ministers caballing against him, with his many erstwhile friends denouncing him as a traitor, he seemed to stand alone in the dark. His patience, his pitifulness, his courage, his sense of justice, all stand out in bold relief. Well did Stanton say at his death, "He belongs to the ages."

Although he was a man of no pronounced creed or belief, he nevertheless had a deep religiosity, and we can safely say in the words of the great Hebrew prophet Micah that Lincoln did justice, loved mercy, and walked humbly before his God.

#### BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 268. An act to excuse certain persons from residence upon homestead lands during 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932 in the drought-stricken areas; and

H. J. Res. 292. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to aid in the establishment of agricultural credit corporations, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.



The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, March 1, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. RAINEY submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, March 1, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

#### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (10 a. m.)

Public works administration, H. R. 6665 and H. R. 6670.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS (10 a. m.)

A bill to amend the air mail act of February 2, 1925, as amended by later acts, further to encourage commercial aviation (H. R. 8390).

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION (10.30 a. m.)

Bills dealing with general suspension, restriction, further restriction, and prohibition of immigration into the United States.

A bill to authorize increased expenditures for the enforcement of the contract-labor provisions of the immigration law (H. R. 9598).

#### COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION (10.30 a. m.)

A bill for the temporary relief of water users on irrigation projects constructed and operated under the reclamation law (S. 3706).

A bill for the rehabilitation of the Stanfield project, Oregon (H. R. 8164).

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

458. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept donations and contributions for use in providing for recreation, amusement, and contentment of enlisted men; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

459. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a bill to permit disbursing officers of the Navy and Marine Corps to use for current expenditures public money received by them from sales and other sources; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

460. A letter from the treasurer of the Washington Rapid Transit Co., transmitting one copy each of balance sheet and list of stockholders of the Washington Rapid Transit Co. as of December 31, 1931; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

461. A letter from the executive officer of the Personnel Classification Board, transmitting a request for permission to dispose of obsolete survey material and questionnaires, so that they may be sold as waste paper or otherwise disposed of in accordance to law; to the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

462. A letter from the secretary of the National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting official report of 1931 of the National Institute of Arts and Letters; to the Committee on the Library.

463. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated February 26, 1932, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, on Willamette River, Oreg. (H. Doc. No. 263); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8691. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain unused Indian cemetery reserves on the Wichita Indian

Reservation in Oklahoma to provide funds for purchase of other suitable burial sites for the Wichita Indians and affiliated bands; with amendment (Rept. No. 639). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Brenham, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 634). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of the Farmers State Bank of Georgetown, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 635). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4910. A bill for the relief of Gust J. Schweitzer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 636). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5922. A bill for the relief of W. A. Peters; with an amendment (Rept. No. 637). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5933. A bill for the relief of John Evans; with an amendment (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 9916) to authorize the conversion of a storage hangar at Fairfield Air Depot, Fairfield, Ohio, into a paint, oil, and dope warehouse at that station; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9917) to authorize the conversion of the Air Corps shops at Langley Field, Va., into a post exchange at that station; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9918) to provide for the commemoration of the death of Granville Allen, first blood shed on soil of State of Kentucky in the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES: A bill (H. R. 9919) to authorize appropriations for construction of buildings, utilities, and appurtenances thereto at Chanute Field, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9920) to authorize appropriations for construction at military posts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOSS: A bill (H. R. 9921) to require contractors on public-building projects to name their subcontractors, material men, and supply men, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GRANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 9922) authorizing the erection of a memorial to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 9923) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Brockton, Mont., in the extension of the public-school building at that place to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 9924) to stabilize the coal-mining industry; regulate interstate and foreign commerce in coal; provide for cooperative marketing; require the licensing of corporations producing and shipping coal in interstate commerce; to secure fair prices to the operators and to consumers, and fair living and working conditions for the miners concerned; and to create a coal commission; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOCH: A bill (H. R. 9925) to provide emergency reductions in the payments of salaries or other pay by the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.



By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 9926) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon in the city of Boise City, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 9927) amending section 23 of the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 9928) to provide that transferees for collection of negotiable instruments shall be preferred creditors of national banks in certain cases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9929) to provide for immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates without interest deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9930) providing regulations governing the sale of foreign securities in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 320) to authorize an appropriation for the American group of the Interparliamentary Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: A bill (H. R. 9931) granting a pension to Frederick F. MacCleverty; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9932) granting an increase of pension to James Elmer Mulford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BARTON: A bill (H. R. 9933) granting a pension to Etta Janes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 9934) for the relief of Ross P. Beckstrom Co.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9935) for the relief of Michael H. Lorden; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9936) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9937) granting an increase of pension to Charity West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9938) for the relief of Charles Samuelson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9939) for the relief of John August Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 9940) to authorize reinstatement of war-risk insurance of John D. Deardourff, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 9941) granting a pension to Emma J. Eberly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARDEN: A bill (H. R. 9942) granting an increase of pension to Martha R. Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 9943) granting an increase of pension to Annie I. Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9944) granting an increase of pension to Margret E. Siford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 9945) for the relief of William D. Wilson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9946) for the relief of Joe Vivian Wood; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9947) for the relief of Thomas A. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9948) for the relief of Jack L. Madden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of Johnnie J. Jones; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9950) for the relief of Oliver Phillips; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 9951) granting an increase of pension to Anna E. Tyler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9952) granting a pension to Annie R. C. Owen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 9953) granting a pension to Sarah S. Shumate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 9954) authorizing the erection of a memorial to Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9955) for the relief of Lucius K. Osterhout; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 9956) granting a pension to William H. Graham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 9957) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Cunningham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9958) granting an increase of pension to Decatur D. Kinser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PARSONS: A bill (H. R. 9959) for the relief of Glenna F. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 9960) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Beers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART: A bill (H. R. 9961) for the relief of John J. Flanagan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9962) for the relief of Percy C. Wright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWICK: A bill (H. R. 9963) granting an increase of pension to Samantha R. Freed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 9964) for the relief of Bonnie S. Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 9965) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Hartsoc Carr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TURPIN: A bill (H. R. 9966) granting a pension to Gwilym T. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 9967) for the relief of Jacob King; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3050. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by Western New York League of Savings and Loan Associations, urging opposition to the bill authorizing the creation of Federal home-loan banks when it comes before the House; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3051. Also, petition of 25 citizens of the fortieth congressional district urging support of the prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3052. Also, resolution adopted by Niagara Lodge, 330, of the International Association of Machinists, urging support of the anti-injunction bill when it comes before the House; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3053. By Mr. BOEHNE: Petition of Robert H. Kelly and others, protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3054. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, branch of Streator, Ill., opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3055. Also, petition of William C. Gridley, Rockford, Ill., and others, opposing the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3056. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition of Helen A. Thomas, and 16 other citizens of West Barrington and Barrington, R. I., opposing the repeal, resubmission, or any modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3057. By Mr. CARTER of California: Petition of the South Berkeley Union, Woman's Christian Temperance



Union, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3058. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of Group No. 1678 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, urging that October 11 of each year be set aside as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3059. By Mr. CHASE: Petition of citizens of Port Matilda, Pa., urging enforcement of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3060. Also, petition of citizens of Kane, Pa., urging enforcement of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3061. Also, petition of citizens of DuBois, Pa., urging enforcement of prohibition law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3062. By Mr. CONDON: Resolution of the Touro Fraternal Association of Rhode Island, composed of over 700 citizens of Rhode Island, opposing the passage of House bill 7436, providing for registration of aliens and a certificate of identification; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3063. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of Harbor and Dock Commission, Oswego, N. Y., protesting against the proposed change in administration and method of procedure in improvement of rivers and harbors; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3064. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Pulaski, N. Y., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1202, providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3065. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of citizens of California, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3066. By Mr. EVANS of Montana: Resolutions of the Montana State branch of the National Woman's Party, urging submission to the States for ratification the equal-rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3067. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of the Chappell Oil Co., Enid, Okla., opposing the levying of a Federal tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3068. Also, petition of the business men and taxpayers of the city of Ringwood; of members of Lone Wolf Post, No. 57, American Legion, Lone Wolf; of Lowery Post, No. 29, American Legion, Lawton; and of Argonne Post, No. 4, American Legion, Enid, all of the State of Oklahoma, urging payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates; also telegram from Clark Moss, commander, Hanes Finley Post, No. 153, American Legion, Wagoner, Okla., urging, on behalf of the post, payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates, and advising said post has gone on record through resolutions favoring enactment of such legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3069. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Newport, Vt.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3070. By Mr. GILCHRIST: Petition of Elmer Shockey and 60 other citizens of Jefferson, Iowa, asking that House bill 1, being the adjusted-compensation bill, be made a law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3071. By Mr. GREENWOOD: Petition of J. B. Thayer, of Bloomington, and 126 other citizens of Monroe County, Ind., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092 or any other compulsory Sunday-observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3072. Also, petition of J. A. Crary and 53 other citizens of Daviess County, Ind., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092, Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3073. By Mr. GRISWOLD: Petition of Elsie McGuffey and 136 other citizens of Markle, Ind., protesting against any change or modification of the prohibition law, and urging strict enforcement of this law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3074. Also, petition of Rev. M. Vayhinger and 27 other citizens of Fairmount, Ind., protesting against any modification of the prohibition law, and urging the strict enforcement of such law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3075. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of numerous citizens of Battle Creek, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of House bill 8092 or any other compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3076. By Mr. JENKINS: Petition signed by 52 citizens of Nelsonville, Ohio, urging Congress to reduce expenses and to not increase taxes, and that Congress give the wheat that is stored by the Government to feed the people that are unemployed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3077. Also, petition signed by 30 adult residents of Jackson, Ohio, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance bill now before Congress, S. 1202; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3078. By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: Petition of approximately 535 citizens of Union Chapel, Hennessey, Kingfisher, Omega, Altoona, and Cashion, Okla., opposing repeal, modification, or resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; and of approximately 400 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Sunday schools of Duncan, Kingfisher, Geary, Sterling, Yukon, and Anadarko, Okla., urging strengthening and rigid enforcement of the prohibition laws, as well as protesting against repeal, modification, or resubmission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3079. Also, resolution adopted by Lowery Post, No. 29, Lawton, Okla., American Legion, Department of Oklahoma, declaring stability and prosperity of country dependent upon regular remunerative employment, ability to adequately protect and defend ourselves from domestic disorders and foreign aggression, calling attention to strife and unrest throughout the world, and favoring recommending to Representatives in Congress the immediate increase of our standing armed forces to 1,000,000 men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3080. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Mrs. Lex Smith, of Teague, Tex., favoring Senate bill 1234, for rural sanitation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3081. By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of Adam Dziedzie, president Group No. 480, Polish National Alliance, Wilkeson, Wash., urging the enactment of House Joint Resolution 144, establishing October 11 of each year as Gen. Casimir Pulaski memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3082. By Mr. KELLER: Petition of Group No. 1892 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of America, urging October 11 of each year to be set aside as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3083. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Ogmar Post, No. 268, Farwell, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3084. Also, petition of System Federation, No. 75, St. Paul, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3085. Also, petition of Northwest Pay Bonus Now Organization of Hibbing, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3086. Also, petition of 10 district presidents of the Minnesota Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging enforcement of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3087. Also, petition of Farmers Union, Thorpe Local No. 174, Lake Lillian, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3088. Also, petition of Farmers Union, Thorpe Local No. 174, Lake Lillian, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 7797; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3089. Also, petition of Farmers Union, Thorpe Local No. 174, Lake Lillian, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 2487; to the Committee on Agriculture.



3090. Also, petition of workers in the stone industry in Minnesota, urging use of native stone and fabrication in Federal construction work; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

3091. Also, petition of United Veterans, Swift County Unit, Benson, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3092. Also, petition of National Association of Letter Carriers, Branch No. 1058, Hibbing, Minn., opposing any decrease in the salaries of the postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3093. Also, petition of Northern Wholesale Hardwood Lumber Association, Minneapolis, Minn., opposing continuation of the National Government in private business and insisting upon a wise expenditure of public funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3094. Also, petition of Central Co-Operative Association, South St. Paul, Minn., asking loaning of money by the Government on a long-time basis through Federal land banks in sufficient amount to pay present farm indebtedness at interest rate not in excess of that fixed on loans made to foreign countries during the World War; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3095. Also, petition of Central Co-Operative Association, South St. Paul, Minn., asking for tariff on importations of oils and fats, etc., from the Philippines, and on all competitive farm commodities imported; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3096. Also, petition of Alta Vista Farmers Union, Local 116, and Wergeland Farmers Union, Local 120, asking that a sales tax be established on all products manufactured for food and clothing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3097. Also, petition of Central Co-Operative Association, South St. Paul, Minn., asking investigation into methods and policies of the Federal Farm Board, etc.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3098. Also, petition of Rod and Gun Club of Forada, Minn., favoring Federal tax on shells instead of the Federal hunting license; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3099. Also, petition of residents of the seventh district of Minnesota, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3100. Also, petition of Malta Local, No. 158, Clinton, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3101. Also, petition of Malta Local, No. 158, Clinton, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 2487 and House bill 7797; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3102. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. I. Livingston and 33 other persons of Corning, Kans., urging the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and opposing any measure of repeal, modification, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3103. Also, resolution of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Institute of Corning, Kans., urging the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and opposing any measure of repeal, modification, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3104. Also, resolution of the Tonganoxie Friends, Tonganoxie, Kans., opposing the resubmission to the States of the repeal of the prohibition law, and urging adequate appropriations for law enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3105. By Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia: Petition of citizens of Monroe County, Ga., protesting against removal and abandonment of airport at Forsyth, Ga.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3106. Also, petition of citizens of Ware County, Ga., protesting against increased tax on tobacco, and requesting that a reduction be made in this tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3107. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of John Foster, United States veterans' hospital, Fort Bayard, N. Mex., favoring the passage of House bill 1; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3108. Also, petition of American Federation of Full-Fashioned Hosiery Workers, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of the LaGuardia-Norris anti-injunction legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3109. Also, petition of United States Building & Loan League, Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring the passage of home loan bank legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3110. Also, petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposing the passage of House bill 9390; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3111. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of sundry residents of Bristol County, Mass., protesting against enactment of Senate bill 1202; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3112. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, opposing House bill 9390; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3113. By Mr. MITCHELL: Petition of Vergil Lambert and others, of Westmoreland, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3114. Also, petition of Mrs. C. R. Hickerson, president Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Coffee County, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3115. By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: Petition of the John J. O'Neill Branch, No. 343, National Association of Letter Carriers, urging support of Sweeney bill (H. R. 6183); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3116. Also, petition of the John J. O'Neill Branch, No. 343, National Association of Letter Carriers, opposing any reduction in the wages of Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3117. Also, petition of Helen Whitfield and 90 other citizens, of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092 or any other compulsory Sunday observance bills; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3118. By Mr. O'CONNOR: Petition signed by 292 citizens of the city of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 8092; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3119. By Mr. PARKER of Georgia: Petition of the Benefit Association of Railway Employees, Savannah (Ga.) Local, No. 214, urging the enactment of Senate bill 2793, providing for the regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of busses and trucks carrying passengers and freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3120. Also, petition of Savannah (Ga.) Aerie, No. 330, Fraternal Order of Eagles, urging the enactment of House bill 7230, providing uniform pensions for the widows and orphans of the veterans of all wars in which the United States has participated; to the Committee on Pensions.

3121. Also, petition of Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, urging the enactment of legislation that will provide pensions for the widows and orphans of World War veterans on the same footing as the widows and orphans of the veterans of other wars in which the United States has engaged; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

3122. Also, petition of the grand jury for Monroe County, Ga., protesting against the contemplated removal and abandonment of the airport now located in said county near the city limits of Forsyth, Ga.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3123. Also, petition of H. D. Solomon and 11 other citizens of Savannah, Ga., urging the enactment of Senate bill 2793 providing for the regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of busses and trucks carrying passengers and freight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3124. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Mrs. W. J. Whiston, Mrs. E. C. Quimley, Mrs. J. D. Van Kleeck, and 32 other residents, of Kingston, Ulster County, N. Y., praying for maintenance of the eighteenth amendment, and opposing repeal, modification, or resubmission to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3125. Also, petition of Frank S. Howland, E. E. Brady, John Slattery, and 24 other citizens of Athens, Greene



County, N. Y., praying for passage of the Beck-Linthicum resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3126. Also, petition of 47 members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Canaan, Columbia County, N. Y., praying for opposition to the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3127. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Potter County, Pa., favoring House bill 8092; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3128. By Mr. ROBINSON: Resolutions sent in by Mrs. F. L. Collis, and signed by Mildred Wheatman, secretary, Iowa Falls Parent-Teachers' Association, Iowa Falls, Iowa; Church of the Nazarene, representing 21 people; Four-Square Gospel, representing 75 people; 50 men and women of the Iowa Falls Christian Church; Iowa Falls Woman's Club, representing 60 people; Congregational Ladies' Bible Class, representing 20 ladies; and First Baptist Church, representing 85 people, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or State legislatures, and urging adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3129. Also, resolution adopted by the union evening service of the Methodist, Presbyterian, and United Brethren Churches, representing 800 people, on February 23, 1932, and sent in by Rev. Roscoe C. Jerrell, pastor of the Methodist Church, Toledo, Iowa, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State legislatures or State conventions, and urging adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3130. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of Pittsburgh, opposing the passage of House bill 9390; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3131. Also, petition of United States Building and Loan League, favoring the passage of home loan bank legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3132. Also, petition of Medical Society of the State of New York, opposing the passage of Senate bill 2146 to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3133. Also, petition of American Federation of Full-Fashioned Hosiery Workers, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the Norris-LaGuardia anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3134. Also, petition of Pennsylvania Grade Crude Oil Association, favoring a reasonable tariff on crude petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3135. Also, petition of J. Loveland, Forest Hills; Mary S. Vatter, of Maspeth, Long Island, and C. Rom, of New York City, N. Y., opposing the proposed Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3136. By Mr. SCHUETZ: Petition of Group No. 633 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, memorializing Congress to proclaim October 11, as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3137. Also, petition of Group No. 1450 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, memorializing Congress to proclaim October 11 as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3138. Also, petition of Group No. 996 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, memorializing Congress to proclaim October 11 as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3139. Also, petition of Group No. 594 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, memorializing Congress to proclaim October 11 as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3140. Also, petition of Group No. 2435 of the Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, memorializing Congress to proclaim October 11 as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3141. By Mr. SELVIG: Petition of Anna Dudley and 18 others and Lelah Presnall and 2 others, of Detroit Lakes; and Mathilde Davis and 8 others, of Rochert and Detroit Lakes, all of the State of Minnesota, protesting against the Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3142. Also, petition of State Senator Carl M. Iverson, of Ashby, Western Grain & Coal Co., Winona, Hjalmar Nilsson, St. Paul, and Petroleum Service Co., Minneapolis, all of the State of Minnesota, opposing enactment of a Federal gasoline tax; and L. M. Olson, Lake Park, Minn., urging reduction in taxes to prevent farmers from losing homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3143. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of J. A. Olander and other citizens, of New Sweden, Me., requesting the enactment of appropriate legislation to place highway trucks and bus lines under regulation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3144. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition of Helmer Reyelt Post, American Legion, Harlan, Iowa, favoring immediate cash payment of balance of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3145. By Mr. SWING: Petition of 72 citizens of San Fernando, Calif., supporting the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and protesting any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3146. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of T. B. Owens and sundry other citizens of Rome, Ga., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3147. By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of members of the Christian Church, the Methodist Church, and the Business and Professional Women's Club, of Clifton, Colo., opposing any measure of resubmission to the States of the eighteenth amendment, and urging adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3148. Also, petition from members of the First Baptist, Methodist, and Church of God Churches, of Olathe, Colo., opposing any measure of resubmission to the States of the eighteenth amendment, and urging adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3149. Also, petition of Mrs. W. H. Cutler and 42 other citizens of Durango, Colo., opposing repeal, modification, or resubmission to the States of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3150. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of First Presbyterian Church of Canonsburg, Pa., supporting the eighteenth amendment, and protesting against submission of an amendment to the States repealing the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3151. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of El Paso business men, protesting a tax upon the automotive industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3152. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of First Presbyterian Church, Loveland, Colo., protesting against submitting eighteenth amendment to the States for a referendum vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3153. Also, petition of Willard (Colo.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, protesting against submitting eighteenth amendment to the States for a referendum vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3154. Also, petition of Loveland (Colo.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, protesting against submission of eighteenth amendment to the States for a referendum vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3155. By Mr. WELCH of California: Resolution of California Farm Bureau Federation, advocating a tariff on all foreign vegetable oils and products from which those oils are derived, and that the importations from the Philippine Islands be subjected to the same restrictions either by granting independence to the islands or by special provision of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3156. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of sundry residents of the fourteenth Massachusetts congressional district,



protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1202 providing for the closing of barber shops on Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3157. By Mr. WITHROW: Memorial in the nature of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin in special session, relating to a preferential excise tax on tobacco products manufactured from tobacco purchased from a cooperative marketing association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3158. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Scottdale, Westmoreland County, Pa., representing 500 citizens, opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3159. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Kensington, representing 30 citizens, opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3160. Also, petition of Group No. 1211, Polish National Alliance, of Mount Pleasant, Westmoreland County, Pa., urging enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3161. Also, petition of Group No. 1760, Polish National Alliance, of New Kensington, Pa., urging enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3162. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of residents of Climax, Mich., protesting against the enactment of Sunday observance bill S. 1202, or any other compulsory religious measures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3163. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Group No. 2213, Polish National Alliance, of Monessen, Pa., urging legislation to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3164. Also, petition of officers of the First Lutheran Sabbath school, of Vandergrift, Pa., representing 700 members, opposing any change in eighteenth amendment, Volstead Act, and other enforcement measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3165. Also, petition of Propeller Club of the United States, port of Pittsburgh, against House bill 9390; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1932

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 24, 1932)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Couzens	Kean	Schall
Austin	Cutting	Kendrick	Sheppard
Bankhead	Dale	Keyes	Shipstead
Barbour	Dickinson	King	Smith
Barkley	Dill	La Follette	Smoot
Bingham	Fess	Lewis	Steiwer
Black	Fletcher	Logan	Stephens
Blaine	Frazier	Long	Thomas, Idaho
Borah	George	McGill	Thomas, Okla.
Bratton	Glass	McNary	Townsend
Brookhart	Glenn	Metcalf	Trammell
Broussard	Goldsborough	Morrison	Vandenberg
Bulkeley	Gore	Moses	Wagner
Bulow	Hale	Neely	Walcott
Byrnes	Harrison	Norbeck	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	Hatfield	Norris	Walsh, Mont.
Caraway	Hayden	Nye	Waterman
Carey	Hebert	Oddie	Watson
Connally	Howell	Patterson	Wheeler
Coolidge	Hull	Reed	White
Copeland	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	
Costigan	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	

Mr. JOHNSON. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] is still detained from the Senate by reason of continued illness. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS] is still detained from the Senate because of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS]. I shall let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. HULL. My colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is necessarily detained from the Senate. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. GLASS. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is absent in attendance upon the disarmament conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the executive officer of the Personnel Classification Board, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to an accumulation of papers on the files of the board not needed in the conduct of business or having any historical interest, and asking for action looking toward their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. DALE and Mr. McKELLAR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a cablegram from the speaker of the House of Representatives of Porto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Cablegram]

SAN JUAN, P. R., February 24, 1932.

Hon. CHARLES CURTIS,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D. C.:

House of Representatives of Porto Rico, met in regular session, resolved to respectfully request Congress to pass H. R. 7230, introduced by Congressman GASQUE, to increase pensions of widows of Spanish-American War veterans.

MANUEL F. ROSSY, Speaker.

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from H. M. Haley, of Goodland, Kans., praying for the passage of the bill (S. 3677) to provide for the establishment of a system of pensions for railroad and transportation employees and for a railroad pension board, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Friendship Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, protesting against the passage of legislation to decrease the salaries of Government employees, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the Friendship Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, protesting against the appointment of retired military personnel and persons not citizens of the District to positions in the municipal offices of the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FESS presented a petition of sundry citizens of the State of Ohio, praying that the coal specifications of Ohio Federal institutions may be so amended as to make possible the purchase of coal mined in Ohio, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented memorials of sundry citizens of Tulia and Friona, in the State of Texas, remonstrating against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRISON presented petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Mississippi, praying for amendment of the World War Veterans' adjusted compensation act, so as to provide that veterans may secure relief within a shorter